

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. LXIII, 4

WHOLE No. 252

CAESAR'S COLLEAGUES IN THE PONTIFICAL COLLEGE.

A list of members of the pontifical college during the republican period was prepared by C. Bardt in his important work, *Die Priester der vier grossen Collegien aus römisch-republikanischer Zeit* (Berlin, 1871). In the period 218-167, when Livy gives fairly complete records of the elections of the chief priests, the names of the pontifices are arranged by Bardt in order of their entrance into the college. But for the time of Caesar he found no criteria which enabled him to determine the order of election of the majority of the pontifices. It is my purpose in this paper to attempt to establish such criteria through a study of two ancient lists of pontifices and to arrange as far as possible in order of seniority in the college a roll of members from the time of Caesar's election in 74-3 to his death in 44.¹ In my list which comprises the entire membership of the college for the year 57 I have included wherever possible the names of the predecessors of the various pontifices. The great Roman priestly colleges in their rolls of membership regularly recorded the name of each

¹ References to ancient sources for well-attested facts in the lives of the pontifices have in general been omitted. For most of the men the full evidence will be found in Drumann-Groebe, *Römische Geschichte* and in the biographical articles in Pauly-Wissowa, *R. E.*, many of which were written by Münzer. Necessary references are given for doubtful questions and for essential biographical details on all men not discussed in these two works. I have only one new name in this period, Mamercus Aemilius Lepidus, to add to Bardt's lists of the pontifices, and the evidence in his case is not conclusive. Bardt's material is repeated, with a few additions which are not always to the point, in Brissaud's list added to his translation of Marquardt, *Röm. Staatsverwaltung*, III (*Le Culte chez les Romains*, I [1889], pp. 385-404).

priest's predecessor in office.² While Livy gives the predecessors for the years 218-168, the information is often lacking for the late republic.

The history of the individual places is of some interest because of the division between patricians and plebeians. Before 300 B. C. there were, according to Livy, four pontifices and four augurs, all patricians. The *Lex Ogulnia* of that year provided four new places in the pontificate and five in the augurate, all to be held by plebeians.³ In the period 218-167, when we have Livy's records, there were nine places in each priesthood, divided between four patricians and five plebeians.⁴ In every case recorded the successor belongs to the same order as his predecessor. When Sulla raised the membership of both colleges to fifteen, some of the new places must have been open to patricians, for Cicero says that patricians made up half of the priesthoods,⁵ and the college of pontifices of 57 consisted of seven patricians and eight plebeians. From a statement of Cicero on the restrictions of patrician birth it appears that all places in the priesthoods, like both places in the consulship, were actually open to

² Two types of records of Roman public priests are found in inscriptions. The first, illustrated by the *Fasti* of the *Salii* (Dessau, 5024, 9339) consists of names arranged in order of election to the college, each name being followed by the name of the man whose place he took. The other type is a record of all the holders of an individual place (the word *decuria* is used technically to describe a place in a priesthood) with dates to show when the place fell to a new priest. To this group belong the inscriptions of the *Sodales Augustales* (Dessau, 5025) and the fragmentary *Fasti sacerdotum* which are records either of the augurs alone or, more probably, of the augurs and pontifices combined (Dessau, 9338). As in the *Fasti sodalium Aug.*, the *decuriae* in the *Fasti sacerdotum* were numbered. There are remains of the end of the first *decuria* and of the beginning of the second, and there is a fragment which belongs to one of the new places established by the *Lex Ogulnia* in 300 B. C. The number of the *decuria* in this case is lost, but it must have been something between five and nine, and was perhaps eight. See Huelsen, *Klio*, II (1902), pp. 275 f., and Münzer, *Hermes*, LII (1917), pp. 152 ff. The first four places in the pontificate and in the augurate seem to have been open to patricians.

³ Livy, X, 6, 3-9, 2. On Livy's uncertainty about the numbers of augurs see X, 6, 7-8. Cf. Cicero, *Rep.*, II, 26. See Wissowa, *R. K.*², p. 503.

⁴ Bardt, *op. cit.*, pp. 32 f.

⁵ *De Domo*, 38: Ita populus Romanus brevi tempore neque regem sacrorum neque flamines nec Salios habebit nec ex parte dimidia reliquos sacerdotes.

plebeians, while the patricians could only compete for certain restricted places.⁶ But the patricians seem usually to have secured the places open to them, though, as we shall see, there are several instances in the late republic in which successor and predecessor belong to different orders.

The method of electing the pontifices is important in a consideration of the membership in the college.⁷ Until the year 104 B. C. the pontifices, the augurs, the *decemviri* (after Sulla *quindecimviri*) *sacris faciundis*, and probably the less well known *epulones* were elected by coöptation within the colleges, which were thus self-perpetuating bodies. Although the vote of the majority usually prevailed, it was not, as Cicero tells us, customary to choose a new member who was a personal enemy of any member of the group.⁸ At least from the late third century B. C. the head of the pontifical college, the semi-magisterial *pontifex maximus*, was elected from the members of the college by a special assembly of seventeen of the thirty-five tribes chosen by lot. In 104 the tribune, Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus, angered because he had not been coöpted into the pontificate as his father's successor, sponsored a law which transferred to the special assembly which elected the *pontifex maximus* the right of electing all the members of the major priesthoods. Under the *Lex Domitia* the priests, though they could not elect, had the exclusive right of making nominations to the people for their respective colleges;⁹ they also went through the old ceremony

⁶ *Ibid.*, 37: Cur enim quisquam vellet tribunum plebis se fieri non licere, angustiore sibi esse petitionem consulatus, in sacerdotium cum possit venire, quia patricio non sit is locus, non venire. Cf. also *Pro Scauro*, 34: illum in pontificatus petitione . . . meminerat fuisse patricium. See Mommsen, *Röm. Forschungen*, II, pp. 80-92.

⁷ On the election of priests see Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*, II³, pp. 24-36, where the evidence is cited in full.

⁸ See the letter to his colleague in the augurate, Appius Claudius Pulcher, *Ad Fam.*, III, 10, 9: amplissimi sacerdotii collegium in quo non modo amicitiam violari apud maiores nostros fas non erat sed ne cooptari quidem sacerdotem licebat qui cuiquam ex collegio esset inimicus.

⁹ The procedure is best attested by Cicero's account of his nomination by Pompey and Hortensius for the augurate, *Phil.*, II, 4. From *Auct. ad Heren.*, I, 20, Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*, II³, p. 30, concluded that each priest had to make a nomination; from Cicero's statement, *loc. cit.*, it is clear that at the time of his election (53-2) not more than two priests could nominate the same man.

of coöpting formally the new member designated by the people. Whereas coöptations within the colleges had usually occurred as soon as there was a vacancy, the elections henceforth seem to have taken place once a year, apparently between the consular and the praetorian *comitia*.¹⁰ They were among the most hotly contested elections of the Roman state. The *Lex Domitia* remained in force until Sulla, after his victory in 82, restored to the priests the right of electing their own members.¹¹ In the year 63 the tribune Titus Labienus, supported by Caesar, who was then a candidate for the office of *pontifex maximus* made vacant by the death of Metellus Pius, secured the passage of a law which revived the *Lex Domitia* and restored the election of the priests to the special assembly.¹² The pontifices of the period 74-44 thus include members elected at different periods under two different systems.

In addition to the fifteen pontifices, who made up the full quota after Sulla, there were other priests who regularly sat with the pontifices—the *rex sacrorum* and the *flamines Martialis* and *Quirinalis*, all three of them patricians, and at least three *pontifices minores*, who were plebeians.¹³ The two lists which have come down to us from the time of Caesar include names of these priests. The *rex* and the *flamines* were never, as far as we know, elected by popular vote. They were chosen by the *pontifex maximus* from nominations made presumably by members of the college.¹⁴

1. Metellus Pius' incomplete List

This list is a record which the *pontifex maximus* Q. Metellus Pius kept of a dinner given on the occasion of the inauguration

¹⁰ See Livy's account of the coöptation of a new pontifex to succeed the *pontifex maximus* in the college, Livy, XXV, 2, 1-2, followed some months later by the election of a new *pontifex maximus*, XXV, 5. See Wissowa, *R. K.*², pp. 488 f. On the time of the *comitia sacerdotum* see Cicero, *Ad Brut.*, I, 5, 4; *Ad Fam.*, VIII, 4, 1.

¹¹ Ps. Asconius, p. 188 (Stangl).

¹² Dio, XXXVII, 37, 1. This is the only specific reference to the *Lex Labiena*. *Comitia pontificia* are referred to by Cicero, *Pro Caelio*, 19.

¹³ See Wissowa, *R. K.*², pp. 501-8. There was no *flamen Dialis* after the death of Merula in 87 until 11 B. C. Cf. Tacitus, *Ann.*, III, 58; Dio, LIV, 36, 1. See my paper, "Caesar's Early Career," *Class. Phil.*, XXXVI (1941), pp. 113-132.

¹⁴ Livy, XL, 42, 11; Tacitus, *Ann.*, IV, 16. See Wissowa, *R. K.*², pp. 487 and 510, note 3.

of L. Cornelius Lentulus as *flamen Martialis*. Macrobius (III, 13, 11) quotes Metellus Pius' account as follows: duobus tricliniis pontifices cubuerunt Q. Catulus, M. Aemilius Lepidus, D. Silanus, C. Caesar . . . rex sacrorum, P. Scaevola, Sextus . . . Q. Cornelius, P. Volumnius, P. Albinovanus et L. Iulius Caesar augur qui eum inauguravit.¹⁵ This list dates between 74-3 B. C. when Caesar became pontifex¹⁶ and 64-3 when Metellus Pius died. The pontifices mentioned are the following:

- Q. Metellus Pius, pontifex maximus, consul 80, plebeian
- Q. Lutatius Catulus, consul 78, plebeian
- M. Aemilius Lepidus (see discussion *infra*), patrician
- D. Iunius Silanus, consul 62, plebeian
- C. Iulius Caesar, consul 59, patrician
-, *rex sacrorum*, patrician
- P. Mucius Scaevola, not otherwise known, plebeian
- Sextus, identity unknown
- L. Cornelius Lentulus, candidate for the consulship 58, inaugurated as *flamen Martialis*, patrician

In addition there were present three men, Q. Cornelius, P. Volumnius, and P. Albinovanus, whom we can identify as *pontifices minores* (and therefore all plebeians) since two of the three appear with that title in the second list, and L. Iulius Caesar who attended not as a member of the college but as the augur who officiated at the inauguration of the new *flamen*. Absent from the dinner—or perhaps omitted from the text—were the *flamen Quirinalis* and eight pontifices who made up the full quota of the college as fixed by the Sullan regulations. I shall return to a discussion of the college of pontifices at this period after considering the second and more complete list.

2. Cicero's List; the complete College of 57 B. C.

This later list consists of thirteen pontifices, two *flamines*, the *rex sacrorum*, and three *pontifices minores*, all of whom attended the meeting of the college, held on September 29, 57, to pass on the validity of the dedication of a shrine of Libertas on the

¹⁵ The notice continues with a list of the women present: in tertio triclinio Popilia Perpennia Licinia Arruntia virgines Vestales et ipsius uxor Publicia flaminica et Sempronia socrus eius. The sumptuous bill of fare follows. Bardt, *op. cit.*, p. 13, argues that the passage is not fragmentary.

¹⁶ Velleius, II, 43, 1. See *Class. Phil.*, XXXVI, pp. 117-20.

site of Cicero's house. Cicero (*De Har. Resp.*, 12), after declaring that ordinarily three pontifices were sufficient for a decision, proceeds in solemn fashion to name the large group which had passed on the question of his house: At vero meam domum P. Lentulus consul et pontifex, P. Servilius, M. Lucullus, Q. Metellus, M'. Glabrio, M. Messalla, L. Lentulus, flamen Martialis, P. Galba, Q. Metellus Scipio, C. Fannius, M. Lepidus, L. Claudius, rex sacrorum, M. Scaurus, M. Crassus, C. Curio, Sex. Caesar, flamen Quirinalis, Q. Cornelius, P. Albinovanus, Q. Terentius, pontifices minores, causa cognita, duobus locis dicta, maxima frequentia amplissimorum ac sapientissimorum civium adstante, omni religione una mente omnes liberaverunt. Nego umquam post sacra constituta . . . ulla de re . . . tam frequens collegium iudicasse.

This list comprises the following members:

- P. Cornelius Lentulus Spinther, consul 57, patrician
- P. Servilius Vatia Isauricus, consul 79, plebeian
- M. Terentius Varro Lucullus, consul 73, plebeian
- Q. Caecilius Metellus Creticus, consul 69, plebeian
- M'. Acilius Glabrio, consul 67, plebeian
- M. Valerius Messalla, consul 61, patrician
- L. Cornelius Lentulus, *flamen Martialis*, candidate for the consulship for 58, patrician
- P. Sulpicius Galba, candidate for the consulship for 63, patrician
- Q. Caecilius Metellus Scipio, consul 52, patrician by birth, plebeian after testamentary adoption by the *pontifex maximus*, Metellus Pius
- C. Fannius, *tribunus plebis* 59, probably praetor 55, plebeian
- M. Aemilius Lepidus, consul 46, *triumvir r. p. c.* 42, *pontifex maximus* 44-13, patrician
- L. Claudius, *rex sacrorum*, patrician. The *praenomen* Lucius is probably a mistake, since Lucius was avoided among the Claudii (Suetonius, *Tib.*, 1).
- M. Aemilius Scaurus, praetor 56, patrician
- M. Licinius Crassus, either the father, consul 70 and 55, or the son, quaestor probably in 54, plebeian
- C. Scribonius Curio, consul 76, plebeian
- Sex. Iulius Caesar, *flamen Quirinalis*, perhaps quaestor 47, patrician
- Q. Cornelius, P. Albinovanus, Q. Terentius, *pontifices minores*, about whose careers nothing definite is known, all plebeians

Absent from the meeting were two pontifices who completed the full membership of the college. They were:

C. Iulius Caesar, consul 59, pontifex since 74-3, *pontifex maximus* since 63, patrician. Caesar was in Gaul at the time.

L. Pinarius Natta, who had held no magistracy, patrician. Natta, who had lately been elected pontifex, was the member of the college who officiated at the dedication of the shrine of Libertas on the site of Cicero's house (Cicero, *De Domo*, 118, 134, 137).

The identical names in the two lists are L. Cornelius Lentulus, *flamen Martialis*, M. Aemilius Lepidus, pontifex, and Q. Cornelius and P. Albinovanus, *pontifices minores*. Caesar, who did not attend the session on Cicero's house, was also a member of the college at both periods. Of the pontifices in Macrobius' incomplete list, Q. Metellus Pius had died in 64-3, Catulus between July 61 and May 60, and Silanus after his consulship in 62. P. Mucius Scaevola and Sextus . . . must also have died, since they have no place in the full college of 57.

In determining the order of entrance into the college Cicero's arrangement of the names is of some significance. P. Lentulus, who heads the list, is obviously placed first because he was consul—and Cicero's benefactor—at the time. The other names, with the *flamen Martialis* and the *rex sacrorum* interrupting the list of the pontifices, are obviously placed in a carefully determined order. The suggestion has been made that, as in inscriptional lists of priests which have been preserved,¹⁷ the names are given in order of entrance into the college.¹⁸ There would seem to be a strong objection to this suggestion because of the fact that the name of M. Aemilius Lepidus occurs in both lists. According to Metellus Pius' list he was a pontifex when L. Lentulus was inaugurated as *flamen Martialis*; in Cicero's list a man of the same name is placed after the *flamen Martialis* and so, if the names are arranged in order of entrance, must have

¹⁷ In addition to the *Fasti Saliorum* mentioned in note 2 *supra*, see the list of *Augustales* of Ostia, *C. I. L.*, XIV, *Suppl.*, 4560-63. The *quindecimviri* listed in the *Acta ludorum saecularium* are probably arranged in order of entrance. Cf. Dessau, 5050; *C. I. L.*, VI, 32323; *N. S.*, 1931, pp. 313 ff. See Mommsen, *Eph. Epig.*, VIII, pp. 242 f.

¹⁸ Marquardt, *Röm. Staatsverw.*, III², p. 243, note 1; Wissowa, *R. K.*², p. 501, note 2. As far as I can ascertain, the suggestion has never been followed up, and no use has been made of it in biographical articles. Thus Münzer, *R. E.*, s. v. Scribonius (10), col. 863, suggests that the elder Curio, who comes last in the list of *pontifices*, secured the priesthood early in his career.

become a member of the college later. In both cases M. Aemilius Lepidus is usually identified with the future triumvir and *pontifex maximus* who was *triumvir monetalis* at some time between 65 and 61, praetor in 49, and presumably held the quaestorship about 58. He was, to judge from his *cursus*, born not later than the year 89. He was the son of the well-known man of the same name who as consul in 78 led a revolt against the Sullan constitution. The son was probably too young to be chosen pontifex before his father's revolt, and he would certainly not have been coöpted into a college which was made up of Sullan nobles, among whom was the elder Lepidus' colleague in the consulship and relentless enemy Q. Lutatius Catulus. The younger Lepidus was faithful to his father's memory; on his coins, with other achievements of his ancestors, there are representations of his father's restoration of the Basilica Aemilia.¹⁹ The emblem of the pontificate which appears on the coins probably indicates that he was a pontifex at this time, though it is possible that the symbol records the priesthood of his ancestor, the famous *pontifex maximus* of the second century. The younger Lepidus' election to the pontificate should be attributed to the influence of Caesar, who some years before, in his sponsorship of the *Lex Plotia* for the return of the exiled adherents of Lepidus, had shown interest in men associated with the revolt of 78 B. C.²⁰ The young Lepidus' pontificate must be dated after Labienus' law of 63 placed the election of priests in the hands of the people. He cannot therefore be identified with the M. Aemilius Lepidus of Metellus Pius' list.

It is possible that that M. Aemilius Lepidus is an otherwise unknown member of the house, perhaps someone who did not live to reach higher offices. But it is also possible that in Macrobius' corrupt text M. should, as in other texts, be emended to the more uncommon Mam(ercus). Mamercus Aemilius Lepidus Livianus, consul of 77, appears as M. in the manuscripts of

¹⁹ These coins are dated by Mommsen, *Röm. Münzwesen*, pp. 633 f., about the year 61, and by Grueber, *Coins of the Roman Republic in the British Museum*, I, pp. 447-50 (who follows Count de Salis) about 65 B. C. The hoards provide no criteria for accepting the earlier date.

²⁰ On the *Lex Plotia* see Suetonius, *Iul.*, 5; Gellius, XIII, 3, 5. Compare also Caesar's interest in 63 in the question of restoring the Sullan proscribed to the right of seeking office, Cicero, *In Pis.*, 4; *Ad Att.*, II, 1, 3; Velleius, II, 43, 4; Pliny, *N. H.*, VII, 117.

Obsequens, LVIII and of Cicero, *Pro Cluentio*, 99.²¹ There is some reason to believe that this Mamercus, who was one of the richest and most important *consulares* of his day, was a pontifex. When Caesar, who had been nominated under Cinna as *flamen Dialis*, was about to be included in the Sullan proscriptions, he was released through the plea of the Vestal Virgins and Mamercus Aemilius and Aurelius Cotta, whom Suetonius (*Iul.*, 1, 2) describes as his *propinqui* and *adfines*. The Vestal Virgins were naturally associated with the plea because of their close religious connection with the *flamen Dialis*. By virtue of his office as pontifex C. Aurelius Cotta had similar associations. It is likely that Mamercus Aemilius also pled for Caesar as pontifex and that he is the man who is erroneously referred to as M. in the text of Macrobius.²²

An examination of the names which follow Lentulus in Cicero's list gives some information as to the relative ages of the men in the list. For the moment I shall consider the pontifices alone, omitting the *flamines* and the *rex*. The first six pontifices after P. Lentulus were, with the exception of Galba, all *consulares*, and Galba had been a candidate for the consulship six years before. All six were thus at least four years beyond the consular age, forty-three. The last six pontifices include four men, Metellus Scipio, Fannius, Lepidus, and Scaurus, who had not yet reached praetorian rank. They also include M. Licinius Crassus, who may be either the elder son of Crassus, a youth who had not yet reached the quaestorship, or Crassus himself, one of the three most important *consulares* of the day—so important that Cicero would hardly have named him next to last among the pontifices unless he was following a prescribed order. I am inclined to

²¹ Manutius' emendation of M. in the Cicero text to Mam. is certainly correct. See the Oxford text of A. C. Clark (1908) and Münzer, *R. E.*, s. v. Staienus. In *C. I. L.*, IV, 1553 the *praenomen* of Mam. Aemilius Scaurus, *consul suffectus* under Tiberius, is erroneously written as M.

²² On the plea of the Vestal Virgins in its relation to Caesar's position as a prospective *flamen Dialis* see Münzer, *Philol.*, XCII (1937), p. 221, note; cf. *Class. Phil.*, XXXVI, pp. 117-8. Cotta was a pontifex by 76 B. C. (cf. Cicero, *N. D.*, I, 61), and had probably secured the priesthood before his exile in 90. On Mamercus Aemilius see Münzer, *Röm. Adelsparteien und Adelsfamilien* (1922), pp. 312 f., 326 f. Nothing is known of him after the period 77-6, although Valerius Maximus' reference to him as *princeps senatus* (VII, 7, 6) has led to the suggestion that he was enrolled as such by the censors of 70.

think that Crassus was the elder son of the triumvir, for there is no other evidence for the father's pontificate, and the elder son may well have been honored by a priesthood just as the younger son Publius was.²³ The latter became an augur, probably as the successor of L. Lucullus in 56.²⁴ The last pontifex in the list, C. Scribonius Curio, was, next to P. Servilius Isauricus, the ranking *consularis* in the college. But it is obvious that the average age of the last six men was much less than that of the first six.

The first two pontifices mentioned after the consul Lentulus, P. Servilius and M. Lucullus, are named elsewhere by Cicero as the two most dignified and experienced members of the college, the men who might properly have officiated instead of the newly appointed Natta at the dedication of the shrine of Libertas.²⁵ Servilius had, as an important member of the college, competed with Caesar for the office of *pontifex maximus* in 63. M. Lucullus spoke for the college in the senate to explain the scope of their decision about the dedication.²⁶ Servilius and Lucullus were certainly the ranking members of the college. There are two other men in the first half of the list whose entrance into the college can be approximately dated. The career of M. Valerius Messalla is known from his *elogium* (Dessau, 46): M. Valerius M. f. M'. [n.] Messalla pontife[x] tr. mil. II. q. pr. urb. co[s.] V. vir a. d. a. i. interr[ex] III censor. As Mommsen has noted,²⁷ the unusual order of offices, with the pontificate first, seems to be chronological. Messalla, like Caesar, apparently secured the pontificate before he had any elective office. He reached the consulship in 61, presumably at the minimum age of 43, for he was younger than Cicero (*Brut.*, 246), who became consul two years earlier at that age. Messalla's quaestorship would date about 73, and his military tribunate before that. He can hardly

²³ The reference given by Brissaud (see note 1 *supra*) for the pontificate of the elder Crassus, Ovid, *Fasti*, VI, 465, does not apply. The interest of a father in securing a priesthood for his son is shown in Cicero's letters (*Ad Brut.*, I, 5 and 14) urging Brutus to support the young Marcus for the pontificate.

²⁴ Plutarch, *Cic.*, 36, 1. On the date see Bardt, *op. cit.*, p. 25.

²⁵ *De Domo*, 132-3; cf. 117-8; *Har. Resp.*, 12.

²⁶ Cicero, *Ad Att.*, IV, 2, 4. Lucullus may have been appointed by the college to speak for the *pontifex maximus* in his absence.

²⁷ *Eph. Epig.*, III, pp. 1 ff. Cf. De Grassi, *Inscriptiones Italiae*, XIII, 3 (1937), 77.

have secured the pontificate later than 76. The next name in the entire list is that of the *flamen Martialis* who, as we have seen, entered upon his office between 73 and 63. Galba, who appears next, seems to have been pontifex as early as 69, the latest possible date for his curule aedileship,²⁸ for coins which he issued in that office have on them the emblems of the pontificate.²⁹ It is thus clear that four of the seven men whose names follow P. Lentulus entered the college before 63.

A *terminus post quem* can also be secured for the election of the eighth man after P. Lentulus, Q. Metellus Scipio.³⁰ As P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica, he was a patrician until 64-3, when, by the will of Metellus Pius, he was adopted into the plebeian house of the Caecilii Metelli. Scipio can hardly have entered the college as a patrician, for in that case a majority of the places in the college would have been open to patricians. Therefore he cannot have become a member until 64-3.

It is moreover significant that the two *pontifices minores* who appear in both lists precede in Cicero, in the same order as in Macrobius, the name of M. Terentius who is not mentioned in Macrobius. Thus they seem to be named in order of seniority.

Since M. Aemilius Lepidus in Macrobius' list cannot be the triumvir, there is no valid argument against the suggestion that Cicero has named in order of election first the pontifices proper with *flamines* and *rex* and then the *pontifices minores*. In favor of that order is not only the curious arrangement of the names but also the advanced age of the men in the first half of the list, the presence in the second half of several comparatively young men, the fact that the two men whom Cicero names as the most experienced come immediately after the consul Lentulus, that four of the first seven names belong to men who had joined the

²⁸ On 69 as the probable date of Galba's curule aedileship see my discussion, *A. J. P.*, LX (1939), p. 200.

²⁹ Grueber, *op. cit.*, I, p. 433; Mommsen, *Röm. Münzwesen*, p. 621, note 452. It is of course possible that the symbols of the pontificate refer to the priesthood of an ancestor of Galba. Three Sulpicii Galbae of the late third and early second century (*R. E.*, nos. 49, 50, 56) are listed as pontifices, and other members of the house may have held the pontificate later. But I agree with Mommsen, *loc. cit.*, and with Münzer, *R. E.*, s. v. Sulpicius (55), in thinking that the emblems refer to P. Galba's own office as pontifex. His place on the list supports their view.

³⁰ On Metellus Scipio see Münzer, *Röm. Adp.*, pp. 315-8; *Hermes*, LXXI (1936), p. 222.

college before 63, and that the eighth man was elected not earlier than 64-3. We may conclude that in the published version of his speech Cicero has carefully placed the members of the college according to the date of their election, perhaps reproducing the order in which, like an academic procession arranged by order of appointment, they filed into the meeting.

There are three pontifices whose names are not arranged in their proper position. They are the consul Lentulus who is mentioned first, and the two pontifices absent from the meeting, Caesar and L. Pinarius Natta. The date of Caesar's coöptation was 74-3, and he should be inserted between Messalla and L. Cornelius Lentulus whose inaugural banquet he attended. The exact position of P. Cornelius Lentulus is impossible to ascertain, but he certainly acquired the office later than Caesar to whom he expressed gratitude *quod per eum in collegium pontificum venerat*.³¹ That probably means that he was chosen by popular vote after Labienus' law of 63, and that Caesar was the pontifex who nominated him to the people. L. Pinarius Natta³² had been made pontifex at the *comitia* of 58, a short time before the shrine of Libertas was dedicated.³³ He was supported by Clodius, the husband of his sister,³⁴ against the candidacy of Clodius'

³¹ Caesar, *B. C.*, I, 22, 4.

³² The name which Cicero avoids using in the *De Domo* can be identified from the fact that the man in question was a stepson of Murena (*De Domo*, 134) whose name, L. Natta, is given in *Pro Murena*, 73. For the *nomen* see the reference to the cult of Hercules, *De Domo*, 134 and Servius Dan. on *Aen.*, VIII, 270, where he is called Pinarius Natta.

³³ Pinarius had become pontifex *raucis illis diebus* (*De Domo*, 118) when the shrine of Libertas was dedicated in 58. He was evidently elected at the *comitia* of that year. Cf. also 117, 132-5, 138-41.

³⁴ The identity of Clodius' wife, sister of L. Pinarius Natta (*De Domo*, 118, 134), presents a difficult problem. Clodius had been married to Fulvia (who was subsequently the wife of the younger Curio and then of Antony) long enough before his death in 52 to have two children by her. Cicero indicates that he was already the husband of Fulvia in 58. Cf. *Phil.*, II, 48: *Intimus erat in tribunatu Clodio qui sua erga me beneficia commemorat; eius omnium incendiorum fax, cuius etiam domi iam tum quiddam molitus est. Quid dicam ipse optime intellegit.* Instead of the usual view that Clodius first married a Pinaria (cf. Drumann-Groebe, II, pp. 309 f.) and afterwards Fulvia, one might suggest that Fulvia was, through her mother Sempronia, the half-sister of Pinarius. In that case Sempronia must have been married three times—to Pinarius, to Fulvius Bambalio, and finally (see note 32 *supra*) to Murena. Pinarius' sister,

brother.³⁵ Natta belonged to an ancient patrician family, famous for its association with the cult of Hercules, but not prominent in political annals. He was still a young man in 57 and had held no political office. If he is identical with the Natta mentioned in a letter of Cicero in 56,³⁶ he died in that year. Another L. Pinarius is known from the late republic, Caesar's nephew or grandnephew who shared with his cousin Q. Pedius the second place after Octavian in Caesar's inheritance. I would suggest that the pontifex Pinarius Natta was the husband of Caesar's niece and the father of Caesar's heir.³⁷

A surer indication of advancement for Caesar's own family is to be found in the appointment of the *flamen Quirinalis* after the election of Curio. For this priesthood, regularly, as we have seen, appointed by the *pontifex maximus*, Caesar chose Sextus Julius Caesar, probably a grandson of the consul of 91, who seems to have been Caesar's uncle.³⁸ The *flamen* is probably identical with the quaestor of the same name whom Caesar left in charge of Syria in 47—a man who is frequently referred to as a relative of Caesar.³⁹ This priesthood was desirable because it did not disqualify its holder from a political career.

who with her mother urged him to dedicate the shrine, has Fulvia's characteristic energy (*De Domo*, 118, 139). Fulvia and Sempronia appear together as witnesses in the trial of Milo in 52, Asconius, *In Milon.*, p. 40 (Clark).

³⁵ *De Domo*, 118. See R. G. Nisbet's edition (Oxford, 1939) where the suggestion is made that the brother referred to was not the well-known Appius, who was an augur, but Gaius.

³⁶ Cicero, *Ad Att.*, IV, 8a, 3: De Natta ex tuis primum scivi litteris; oderam hominem. The last two words accord with Cicero's sentiments toward the pontifex Natta.

³⁷ Suetonius, *Iul.*, 83; Appian, *B.C.*, III, 22. See Münzer, *Hermes*, LXXI (1936), pp. 226 ff. on the question whether Pinarius and Pedius were nephews or great-nephews of Caesar. If my suggestion is correct, Caesar's heir would have had the *cognomen* Natta, and so would not be identical, as Münzer believes that he was, with Pinarius Scarpus, legate of Antony in command of the Cyrenaica. See *Pros. Imp. Rom.*, III, p. 40.

³⁸ See the genealogical table of the Iulii, *R. E.*, s. v. Iulius, col. 182.

³⁹ Amicum et necessarium suum, *Bell. Alex.*, 66, 1; *συγγενής*, Josephus, *Ant.*, XIV, 160; Dio, XLVII, 26, 3; Appian, *B.C.*, III, 77; IV, 58. Münzer, *R. E.*, s. v. Iulius (152, 153), col. 477 assumes that the *flamen Quirinalis* was a son of the consul of 91 and that the quaestor of 47 was the son of the latter. Cf. also Drumann-Groebe, III, p. 689. But the quaestor of 47, born presumably about 78, was old enough to become a

Caesar had at an earlier period, after the election of Lepidus (in 62?), filled the office of *rex sacrorum*, another one of the special priesthoods over which as *pontifex maximus* he had control. The post, undesirable since it prevented its holder from seeking any magistracy, was bestowed on an unknown member of the Claudian house.⁴⁰ But it is noteworthy that Caesar did not fill the office of *flamen Dialis*, which had been vacant since the year 88. This was the priesthood for which Caesar himself had been nominated.

It is possible now to secure approximate dates for the election of the later members of the pontificate. Candidacy under the *Lex Labiena* could hardly have taken place before the year 62, for the pontifices, in anticipation of the law, would have hastened to coöpt immediately members to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Metellus Pius⁴¹ and of any other pontifices who had died at this time. For later years the *comitia sacerdotum* were probably established at this time in their position between the consular and the praetorian elections.

Metellus Scipio probably took his adoptive father's place in 64-3. Sons often sought the places made vacant by the death of their fathers. Fannius, the next man on the list, may also have been coöpted, perhaps to succeed Scaevola of the earlier list, before the *Lex Labiena* was passed. After that law had come into force, the commendation of Caesar as *pontifex maximus* probably had a good deal of influence on the election of members of the college. Fannius would hardly have been supported by Caesar and his henchmen, for he was a staunch conservative. He was one of the accusers of Clodius in the famous trial *de incestu* and one of the three tribunes who opposed Caesar in 59.⁴² The later men in the list, beginning with Lepidus, were elected by popular vote. In the period 62-60 there seem to have been

flamen about the year 60. Caesar had been destined for the office of *flamen Dialis* when he was sixteen. See *Class. Phil.*, XXXVI, pp. 113 ff.

⁴⁰ Cf. Cicero, *De Domo* 127: *Etiam tu, rex, disce a gentili tuo* (i.e. Clodius). This passage makes it clear that there is no mistake about the *nomen* of the rex, though his *praenomen* Lucius is probably wrong. See Mommsen, *Röm. Forsch.*, I, p. 15, note.

⁴¹ See my note on "The Election of the *Pontifex maximus* in the Late Republic" to appear in *Classical Philology*.

⁴² Fannius' pontificate is also attested by coins. Cf. *C. I. L.*, I², *App. Num.* 376. He was probably a grandson of the consul of 122 who opposed Gaius Gracchus.

two important factions at Rome, that of Crassus and Caesar, aided from the year 61 by Clodius, and that of Pompey, who was very successful in obtaining honors for his former officers. These two factions combined in 60 into the ring which is popularly known as the first triumvirate. The control which the triumvirs exercised over the priestly *comitia* is clearly indicated by Cicero's comments on the augurate which he vainly hoped to secure in 59.⁴³ To the influence of Caesar and Crassus we can attribute the election of the pontifices M. Aemilius Lepidus, whom we have already considered, Crassus (father or son), and probably the consular Curio. In the last contest, if it took place in 61 or 60, Clodius would have had special interest, for Curio, after attempting in vain to forestall senatorial action that was unfavorable to Clodius, defended him in his trial in 61.⁴⁴ By the time of the elections of 59 Curio had broken with Clodius and the triumvirs.⁴⁵ To the influence of Pompey we can attribute the election of M. Aemilius Scaurus as pontifex. Scaurus had been Pompey's quaestor in the East, and, after staying behind in command of Syria, probably reached Rome in time for the *comitia* of 60.⁴⁶ That is the year to which I would assign the elections of Scaurus, Crassus, and Curio. It may be noted that there was at least one plebeian vacancy to be filled in 60, that caused by the death of Catulus,⁴⁷ and that Silanus' place

⁴³ *Ad Att.*, II, 5, 2; 7, 3; 9, 2; *In Vat.*, 19.

⁴⁴ *Ad Att.*, I, 14, 5; *In Clodium et Curionem*, Schol. Bob., pp. 85-91 (Stangl).

⁴⁵ *Ad Att.*, II, 7, 3; see Münzer, *R. E.*, s. v. Scribonius (10), col. 866. After that time Curio could hardly have been one of the intimates (*familiarissimos*) whom Cicero (*De Domo*, 118) says that Clodius had in the college.

⁴⁶ Scaurus had been left in charge of Syria (Josephus, *Ant.*, XIV, 79; *Bell.*, I, 157) on Pompey's departure, presumably late in 63. He was succeeded there probably in 61 by L. Marcius Philippus. Cf. Appian, *Syr.*, 51 and Münzer's discussion *R. E.*, s. v. Marcius (76). Scaurus could easily have reached Rome in time for the *comitia* of 60. From Cicero, *Ad Brut.*, I, 5, 3 it is clear that there was no rule against candidacy for a priesthood *in absentia*, though of course a man who was on hand to solicit votes had an advantage. On Scaurus as a patrician candidate see Cicero, *Pro Scauro*, 34.

⁴⁷ Catulus died between July of 61 and May of 60. Cf. Cicero, *Ad Att.*, I, 16, 5; 20, 3. Dio, XXXVII, 46, 3, indicates that his death took place in 61. It is practically certain that the vacancy would have been filled at the *comitia* of 60.

may have had to be filled at the same time. Crassus and Curio would thus have replaced Catulus and Silanus in the college. Lepidus, whose name is separated from theirs by the name of the *rex sacrorum*, was presumably elected earlier. If, as I think probable, he was nominated by Caesar, we must place his election in 62, for Caesar was in Spain at the time of the *comitia* of 61. Lentulus, whom Caesar nominated, must have been elected in a year when Caesar was in Rome—either 62, 60, or 59. Natta, elected in 58, seems still to have been in 57 the last in order of entrance in the college.

3. The College in the Seventies

We can now secure a more exact date for the banquet described in Macrobius' excerpt from Metellus Pius' record, and we can study the composition of the college at an earlier time. The banquet must date between the coöptation of Caesar in 74-3, and that of Galba, not later than 69, for Galba was elected after L. Lentulus, the *flamen Martialis*.⁴⁸ Metellus Pius' list seems also to be arranged in order of seniority, for the distinguished consular Catulus comes first, and Caesar, who had lately been coöpted, comes third from the end. Moreover, as in Cicero's list, the *rex sacrorum* interrupts the order of the pontifices, and the *pontifices minores* come at the end of the list, with the two men who are also in Cicero's list appearing in the same order. The College at that period must also have included all the names which precede the *flamen Martialis* in Cicero—P. Servilius Vatia, M. Lucullus, Q. Metellus Creticus, M'. Acilius Glabrio, M. Valerius Messalla. All these men were either absent from the dinner or have had their names omitted from the fragmentary list.

For the period of this dinner we have the names of eleven of the fifteen pontifices, and the *praenomen* Sextus of a twelfth. In the following combination of the two lists accompanied by notes on the family connections of the men, it is impossible to establish with certainty the relative order of some of the names:

Q. Metellus Pius, *pontifex maximus*, consul 80, plebeian. Son of the famous Numidicus, consul of 109. Metellus had secured

⁴⁸ If, as is probable but not certain, Metellus Pius was present at the dinner, the date could be narrowed to the years 70-69, for he did not return from his Spanish proconsulship until the end of 71 (Appian, *B. C.*, I, 121).

election to the pontificate by popular vote when he was still *adulescens*.⁴⁹

Q. Lutatius Catulus, consul 78, plebeian. As son of the great general, rival of Marius for the glory of the conquest of Cimbri and Teutones, he probably secured the office early in his career.

P. Servilius Vatia Isauricus, consul 79, plebeian. His mother was a Caecilia Metella, daughter of Q. Metellus Macedonicus and he was a first cousin of Q. Metellus Creticus.

Mam. Aemilius Lepidus Livianus(?), consul 77, patrician.⁵⁰ Probably a brother of M. Livius Drusus, tr. of 91. Father-in-law of Metellus Scipio.

M. Terentius Varro Lucullus, consul 73, plebeian. Brother of L. Licinius Lucullus. Their father was praetor in 104; their mother was another Caecilia Metella, daughter of L. Metellus Calvus, consul of 142. M. Lucullus was a first cousin of Q. Metellus Pius, the *pontifex maximus*.

Q. Caecilius Metellus Creticus, consul 69, plebeian. Son of C. Metellus Caprarius, consul of 113, distant cousin of the *pontifex maximus*, first cousin of P. Servilius Vatia, father-in-law of the elder son of M. Crassus.

M'. Acilius Glabrio, consul 67, plebeian, son of the tribune of 123 or 122, who seems to have died young and to have left his son to the care of the son's maternal grandfather, a Scaevola, probably to be identified with Mucius Scaevola, the famous augur.⁵¹ Glabrio's wife was Aemilia, daughter of M. Aemilius Scaurus, and sister of the pontifex who was elected later. At the command of Sulla, who married her mother, Glabrio had to give her up to Pompey.

M. Valerius Messalla, consul 61, patrician. Member of a branch of the Valerii which had not reached the consulship since 161; probably a nephew of Sulla's fifth and last wife, a relationship which may explain his advancement.⁵²

D. Iunius Silanus, consul 62, plebeian, probably a son of the consul of 109. His wife was the patrician Servilia, mother by a previous marriage of M. Brutus who was later a pontifex.

⁴⁹ *De vir. ill.*, 63: *Adolescens in petitione praeturae et pontificatus consularibus viris praelatus est*. The reference to the praetorship is obviously an error.

⁵⁰ See note 22 *supra*.

⁵¹ See Münzer, *Röm. Adp.*, pp. 75-80.

⁵² Plutarch, *Sulla*, 35; cf. Münzer, *De Gente Valeria* (1891), p. 52.

C. Iulius Caesar, consul 59, patrician, elected in place of his kinsman, C. Aurelius Cotta, consul 75, plebeian.

P. Mucius Scaevola, plebeian. An otherwise unknown member of an important family which provided three *pontifices maximi* between 132 and 82 B. C. Probably the son of the last of these.⁵³

This list provides the names of eight plebeian members and of three patricians. If the college consisted at this period, as in 57, of eight plebeians and seven patricians, the unknown Sextus should be added to the patricians. The *praenomen* Sextus is known in only two of the fourteen patrician *gentes* which still existed in the late republic⁵⁴—the Iulii Caesares and the Quintilii Vari. Since there was already a Iulius Caesar in the college, it is not unlikely that Sextus belonged to the Quintilii Vari, though he cannot be identified with either of the known men of the name—a praetor of 57⁵⁵ and a quaestor of 49.⁵⁶ There were three additional members, presumably patrician, about whom we have no information.

The college of the seventies, as far as we can reconstruct it, was made up almost entirely of representatives of noble families who were aligned with Sulla in the Civil Wars of 88-2. Through either their fathers or their mothers four of the pontifices belonged to the powerful Caecilii Metelli,⁵⁷ and two to the important priestly house of the Mucii Scaevolae.⁵⁸ A few men in the list had probably secured the priesthood before the disturbances began in 88. Among them we can certainly include Q. Caecilius

⁵³ This is the suggestion of Münzer, *R. E.*, s. v. Mucius (18).

⁵⁴ See Mommsen's list, *Röm. Forsch.*, I, p. 122.

⁵⁵ Cicero, *Or. post Red. in Sen.*, 23. The name given is Sextus Quinctilius.

⁵⁶ Caesar, *B. C.*, I, 23; II, 28.

⁵⁷ The pontifices were not restricted as the augurs were (Dio, XXXIX, 17) by a rule which forbade the election of two members of one family to the priesthood. After Metellus Scipio had entered the college, probably as successor of his adoptive father, there were again two Caecilii Metelli among the pontifices. In the college of 57 besides Servilius and M. Lucullus, another pontifex, M. Aemilius Scaurus, was the son of a Caecilia Metella. M. Crassus of that list, if he was the son of the triumvir, was the husband of a Caecilia Metella, the woman whose tomb stands on the Appian Way. On some of the relationships see Cicero, *De Domo*, 123; *Or. post Red. in Sen.*, 37. For the family of the Metelli see Syme, *The Roman Revolution* (1939), Genealogical Table I.

⁵⁸ In the college of 57 Metellus Scipio was the grandson of a Mucia.

Metellus Pius, Sulla's most important general, who became *pontifex maximus* in 81. It is likely that Catulus and C. Aurelius Cotta whom Caesar succeeded were also elected to the office before the Civil Wars began. After Sulla's victory there were many vacancies to be filled, for priests had lost their lives in the proscriptions and new places were opened by Sulla's enlargement of the college. The pontifices, to whom the right of choosing their own members had been restored, naturally selected members of families belonging to the Sullan oligarchy. Servilius, Catulus, Cotta, Mamercus Aemilius, and M. Lucullus, as well as Metellus Pius, were active under Sulla. Valerius Messalla probably owed his election to his relationship to Sulla's wife.

But there is one name in the list which is distinctly out of place in this group of Sullan supporters—the young Caesar, nephew of Marius' wife and husband of Cinna's daughter whom he had refused to divorce at Sulla's command. In spite of some uncertainty about the relative order of names, there can be little doubt that in the names which precede Caesar's we have nine of the fourteen pontifices who elected him. These nine men were all henchmen of Sulla, and two of them, Metellus Pius and Catulus, were hereditary enemies of Marius. It is evident that in spite of his background Caesar had won the favor of a group of Sullan oligarchs.⁵⁹ His vigorous attacks on the Sullan constitution were still in the future.

Caesar's chances of obtaining the pontificate were probably better because he was a patrician, for, with the disappearance of many patrician families, patrician candidates must have been scarce. But it is a curious fact that he succeeded a plebeian, his kinsman, C. Aurelius Cotta. In the great priesthoods this is the first known case in which the office was bestowed on a man of

⁵⁹ On Caesar's election to the pontificate see *Class. Phil.*, XXXVI, pp. 117-20. Caesar, who was elected while he was absent in the East and so could have made no personal bid for support, must have had strong influences at work for him at Rome. Mamercus Aemilius, who had pled for Caesar with Sulla, may have been one of his sponsors. I am tempted to suspect that Servilia, whose relations with Caesar were long a subject of gossip in Rome, may have been active in his behalf. She was a member of the famous house of the Servilii Caepiones and a cousin of Catulus. Her second husband Silanus was a pontifex at the time. It is to be noted that later her son M. Brutus and her son-in-law Lepidus were members of the college.

different status from his predecessor. Cotta seems to have held one of the open places. He was probably elected to the pontificate before his exile in 90 B. C.,⁶⁰ that is by popular vote under the *Lex Domitia*. The fact that he held a place open to patricians may mean that patricians were at a disadvantage in the elections of 103-82. But under the Sullan system there were no such disadvantages. Sulla, who opened some of the new places to patricians, may have had special interest in maintaining the prerogatives of the group to which he belonged. Sulla's traditions may in part explain why the pontifices elected Caesar and (if I am right in my identification of Sextus) a member of the comparatively unimportant patrician Quintilii Vari.

Immediately after he secured the pontificate, Caesar began his open opposition to the oligarchs in power. He must soon have been at variance with several of his colleagues, notably the important conservatives Metellus Pius, M. Lucullus, and Catulus,⁶¹ who was Caesar's bitter enemy certainly as early as the year 65. It was particularly against Catulus that Caesar conducted his campaign for the office of *pontifex maximus* in 63. Servilius Vatia was also a candidate,⁶² and the success of Caesar, a young man who had not yet held the praetorship, against these two distinguished *consulares* was the first great victory of his career. Caesar's election was due to extensive bribery and also to the popularity of Labienus' law which he had supported. The general view that that law dealt with the election of the *pontifex maximus* has no support in ancient evidence.⁶³ Sulla had probably left the election of the *pontifex maximus* in the hands of the people.

4. The Pontifices from 57 to 44

Between 57 and 50 there were several deaths in the college. L. Lentulus, *flamen Martialis*, died in 56, Natta, if he is the man mentioned by Cicero, in the same year, M. Lucullus and Glabrio⁶⁴

⁶⁰ See note 22 *supra*.

⁶¹ These men were among the five *principes civitatis* who were witnesses for the prosecution of Cornelius, the tribune famous for his popular legislation in 67. Cf. Asconius, p. 60 C.

⁶² Plutarch, *Caes.*, 7, 1; on the special claims to the office which Servilius had because of his ancestry see Münzer, *Röm. Adp.*, p. 360.

⁶³ See note 41 *supra*.

⁶⁴ On the date of Glabrio's death see Münzer, *op. cit.*, p. 276.

probably by the year 54, Q. Metellus Creticus between 54 and 50, Curio in 53. M. Crassus, if he is the triumvir, met his death in 53, if he is the triumvir's son probably in 49 or 48. Scaurus, who was exiled in 52, was presumably replaced, for, unlike the augurs (Plutarch, *Q. R.*, 99), the pontifices had no rule against filling a vacancy caused by exile. The only men known to have been elected to the pontificate between 57 and 50 are the younger Curio, L. Domitius Ahenobarbus, and Q. Caepio (M. Iunius) Brutus. The first two men secured the priesthood as plebeians, the third as a patrician. Curio was elected, perhaps as his father's successor, in 52 or 51.⁶⁵ At that time he had not yet gone over to Caesar. Domitius, son of the *pontifex maximus* who had, as tribune, first given the people the right of electing priests, secured his priesthood, as he did his consulship for 54, in open opposition to Caesar and perhaps to Pompey too, whom he did not join until the beginning of the Civil War. His election should be placed before the year 50, in which he was defeated for the augurate by Antony, the candidate supported by Caesar's influence. Otherwise Caelius, who writes to Cicero of the contest for the augurate (*Ad Fam.*, VIII, 14, 1), would surely have mentioned the pontificate. Domitius, who was not less a demagogue than his father, was apparently trying to have himself elected to the two chief priesthoods in the state—a goal that no man of the late republic except the dictator Caesar reached. Brutus must have been a pontifex before the year 49, for Cicero (*Brut.*, 211-2) speaks of Metellus Scipio as his colleague, and the two must therefore have served together before the Civil War. For his election Brutus may well have had the support of Caesar who, because of his devotion to Brutus' mother, had protected the young man against the accusations of Vettius in 59. Caesar's interest in the candidacy of Antony for the augurate in 50 (*B. G.*, VIII, 50) shows that he concerned himself with priestly elections while he was in Gaul.

⁶⁵ Curio was already a pontifex in 50, the year of his tribunate, when he made an unsuccessful attempt to force the college to intercalate a month (Dio, XL, 62, 1; on the date see Caelius' letter, Cicero, *Ad Fam.*, VIII, 6, 5). In a letter written to Curio late in 51 Cicero (*Ad Fam.*, II, 7, 3) recalled his activity in commending Curio for the priesthood. Since the letter implies that Cicero had been concerned with the question recently, the election may have taken place in 51, though Curio's candidacy is not mentioned in Caelius' letter, *Ad Fam.*, VIII, 4, in which the priestly *comitia* and Curio's candidacy for the tribunate are referred to.

In the Civil War which broke out in 49 the pontifices were divided in their allegiance between Caesar and Pompey. Among Caesar's active supporters were M. Aemilius Lepidus, Curio, and the younger Crassus (pontifex?). Caesar seems also to have had the passive support of the aged Servilius whose son was made consul in 48. With Pompey's forces were his father-in-law Q. Metellus Scipio, C. Fannius, P. Lentulus, Domitius, and Brutus. According to Caesar there was an altercation in Pompey's camp between Domitius, Lentulus, and Scipio, each man urging his claims as successor to Caesar's priesthood.⁶⁶ The death of these three men and of the younger Curio and C. Fannius took place in the Civil War. Tiberius Claudius Nero, father of the emperor, succeeded to the place of Scipio,⁶⁷ and Caesar's nephew, the young Octavius, to that of Domitius.⁶⁸ In the period before the death of Caesar Cn. Domitius Calvinus⁶⁹ and C. Antonius⁷⁰

⁶⁶ Caesar, *B. C.*, III, 83, 1: Iam de sacerdotio Caesaris Domitius, Scipio Spintherque Lentulus cotidianis sermonibus ad gravissimas verborum contumelias palam descenderunt cum Lentulus aetatis honorem ostentaret, Domitius urbanam gratiam dignitatemque iactaret, Scipio adfinitate Pompei confideret.

⁶⁷ Suetonius, *Tib.*, 4: Pontifex in locum P. Scipionis substitutus. On the status of the two men see the discussion *infra*.

⁶⁸ Nicolaus Dam., *Vita Caes.*, 4: ἐνεγράφη εἰς τὴν ἱερωσύνην εἰς τὸν Δευκίου Δομνίου τόπον τετελευτηκότος. Cf. Velleius, II, 59, 3: pontificatusque sacerdotio puerum honoravit. Nicolaus dates Octavius' election to the pontificate immediately after he took the *toga virilis*, an event which took place on October 18, 48 B. C. See Gardthausen, *Augustus und seine Zeit*, II, p. 20. But, except for the plebeian officers, no magistrates were elected in that year. The consuls of 47 were not chosen until after Caesar's return to Rome late in 47. Cf. Dio, XLII, 20, 4; 27, 2; 55, 4. Since it seems unlikely that the *comitia sacerdotum* would have been held in a year when *comitia* for the curule magistrates were omitted, I think it probable that Octavius was not elected to the pontificate until 47. Octavius, who was still a plebeian at this time, succeeded to a plebeian place. The inscription *C. I. L.*, I², 794, C. Iulius Caesar pontif., is probably a record of his pontificate set up in 44 after he had been adopted by Caesar's will.

⁶⁹ Domitius Calvinus' pontificate is attested by *C. I. L.*, VI, 1301 and by the emblems of the pontificate on coins (Grueber, *op. cit.*, II, p. 373). Valerius Maximus (VIII, 11, 2) reports that Caesar and Spurius met at the house of Calvinus *ad officium* on the morning of the Ides of March. Münzer, *R. E.*, s. v. Domitius (43), associates the *officium* with a sacrifice, and concludes that Calvinus was already a pontifex at that time. As pontifex Calvinus restored the Regia in 36.

⁷⁰ His pontificate is recorded on coins which he issued as proconsul of

seem also to have obtained the pontificate. But we cannot reconstitute the whole college at any period after the year 57.

In the years of his dictatorship Caesar increased the membership in the great colleges from fifteen to sixteen and was himself elected to the augurate.⁷¹ He is the first man since the famous Cunctator, Q. Fabius Maximus, who is known to have been a member of the two most important priestly colleges.⁷² In his *Lex de sacerdotiis* Caesar made some changes in the election of priests.⁷³

Actually the election of priests from the year 49 on was as much a sham as was the election of magistrates. Dio tells us that Caesar, during his brief stay in Rome at the end of 49, not only made provisions for magistrates for the coming year, but also filled the places in the priesthoods. For the priesthoods, Dio goes on to say, Caesar did not observe all the usages which had hitherto been customary.⁷⁴

In filling the priesthoods in the years 49-44 one of the things that Caesar seems to have neglected was the balance between patricians and plebeians. In the great priesthoods the only known case before 49 of a successor who differed in status from his predecessor was that of Caesar himself. I have already suggested that this may mean that under the *Lex Domitia* patricians were at a disadvantage in the elections. Under the Sullan regulations and also after the *Lex Labiena* was passed, the patricians, in spite of their diminished numbers, were at no disadvantage. In the years 62-57 five patricians were elected to the pontificate, in contrast to two or possibly three plebeians, and the college of 57 maintained the traditional relationship by which the plebeian membership was larger by one than the patrician. Caesar, whose commendation must have counted for much after he became

Macedonia in 44-3. See Grueber, *op. cit.*, II, p. 470. He had probably secured the office before the death of Caesar.

⁷¹ Dio, XLII, 51, 4; on the use that Caesar made of the priesthoods in rewarding his supporters see XLIII, 51, 9.

⁷² For combinations of priesthoods held by one man see Wissowa, *R. K.*², p. 493, note 2.

⁷³ Cicero, *Ad Brut.*, I, 5, 3. The provisions of the law are not known, though from Cicero, *Phil.*, II, 4 it has been inferred that conditions of nomination were changed.

⁷⁴ Dio, XLI, 36, 3: *ιερέας τε ἀντὶ τῶν ἀπολωλότων ἀντικατέστησεν οὐ πάντα τὰ κατ' αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ τοιοῦτῳ νενομισμένα τηρήσας.*

pontifex maximus, was evidently, like Sulla, interested in the advancement of the class to which he himself belonged.⁷⁵ But in filling vacancies in the priesthoods after the year 49 Caesar seems at times to have disregarded the status of the candidates. Thus in the pontificate Metellus Scipio, a plebeian, was succeeded by Ti. Claudius Nero, patrician, and in the augurate Appius Claudius, patrician, was succeeded by P. Vatinius, plebeian.⁷⁶ The custom of disregarding status in the succession seems to have continued. In 40 B. C. the first place in the augurate, undoubtedly open to patricians, was secured by a plebeian.⁷⁷ The continued decline of patrician stock, not adequately supplemented by Caesar's awards of the patriciate, may have had something to do with the change in policy, though it is to be noted that in one instance a patrician secured the place of a plebeian.

5. The Effect of Popular Election on the Choice of Pontifices

We now have the names of at least nine men—Lentulus, Lepidus, Scaurus, Crassus, the elder Curio, Pinarius Natta, Brutus, Domitius Ahenobarbus, and the younger Curio—who were elected to the pontificate by popular vote between the passage of the *Lex Labiena* in 63 and the year 49. After that time Caesar had virtually appointive power in the choice of priests. Altheim has recently expressed the belief that the transfer of elections to the people broke the authority of the priestly tradition by enlarging the circle from which the priests might be chosen.⁷⁸ Let us see what we know of these nine men. P. Lentulus Spinther, though his father is unknown, was a member of a distinguished branch of the Cornelii which had held many consulships. Lepidus and Scaurus, members of the ancient Aemilian house, both had fathers who had reached the consulship. Lepidus was a descendant of the great man who for about thirty years in the second century was *pontifex maximus* and *princeps senatus*.⁷⁹ Scaurus' father was also *princeps senatus*

⁷⁵ On the interest of Caesar and Sulla in the patricians see Syme, *op. cit.*, pp. 68 f.; Münzer, *Röm. Adp.*, p. 358.

⁷⁶ Cicero, *Ad Fam.*, V, 10, 2; see Mommsen, *Röm. Forsch.*, I, p. 81.

⁷⁷ Dessau, 9338, 3. Münzer, *Hermes*, LII (1917), pp. 152 ff., suggested that the augur whose place fell vacant in 40 was L. Iulius Caesar.

⁷⁸ *A History of Roman Religion*, translated by Harold Mattingly (New York, 1937), p. 331.

⁷⁹ Cicero, *Phil.*, XIII, 15: Haec si cogitas, es M. Lepidus, pontifex

and a member either of the pontificate or of the augurate.⁸⁰ Crassus—either father or son—also belonged to a consular family, prominent long before the triumvir became one of the ruling men of Rome. The elder Curio was the son of a man who had apparently reached praetorian rank.⁸¹ The younger Curio had the prestige of his father to aid him. Natta, as we have seen, belonged to an obscure patrician house. M. Brutus was by adoption a member of the noble patrician house of the Servilii Caepiones, very important in the late second century. Domitius was the son of the *consularis* and *pontifex maximus* who was responsible for the popular election of priests. The elder Curio secured the pontificate long after, Lentulus only a short time before the consulship, and Domitius obtained the two honors at almost the same time. The five other men in the list secured the priesthood early in their careers. Bardt has shown that the sons of the great consular families often obtained their priest-hoods early, while new men or men of families that were not noble had to wait until late in their careers for such honors.⁸² This rule holds for the pontifices Glabrio, Messalla, Caesar, Galba, Metellus Scipio, and Fannius (if he belongs in this list), elected by the college, and it also holds for the majority of the men elected between 63 and 50. It may further be noted that except for the elder Curio and the patrician Natta, all the men in the later list belonged to houses that had lately held consulships. Popular election did not enlarge the circle from which the pontifices were chosen.⁸³ The Roman electorate was snobbish,

maximus, M. Lepidi pontificis maximi pronepos. On the influence of his ancestor in causing Lepidus to seek the priesthood see Münzer, *Röm. Adp.*, pp. 359 f.

⁸⁰ See the priestly *Fasti*, Dessau, 9338, 4. Scaurus is mentioned as an augur by Asconius, p. 21 C. But from the incident reported by Suetonius, *Nero*, 2, it is possible that Asconius has by mistake named him as augur instead of pontifex. See R. M. Geer, *Class. Phil.*, XXIV (1929), pp. 292 ff.

⁸¹ Cicero, *Brut.*, 124.

⁸² Bardt, *op. cit.*, p. 37. The *pontifex maximus* Metellus Pius had been elected as *adulescens*, obviously under the *Lex Domitia*. It is interesting that Cicero in 43 was trying to secure the election of his twenty-two year old son to the pontificate.

⁸³ A study of the augurs, most of whose names are known for the year 50, and of the other priesthoods, about which we have less information, proves that patricians were also successful in these colleges in securing

and the candidate for the priesthood even more than the aspirants for magistracies had to fear the insistent question *quis homo hic est, quo patre natus?*⁸⁴

There was, however, one distinguishing feature of the men who were elected to the pontificate after the year 63. With the exception of Domitius and perhaps of the younger Curio, who joined Caesar after he became pontifex, they were adherents of all or one of the triumvirs, Caesar, Pompey, and Crassus, the men who dominated the elections in these years. Though the new members belonged in general to the old nobility, in most cases they were probably not the nobles whom the pontifices themselves would have selected. The custom of excluding from the college a man who was a personal enemy of any one of the priests was, as Cicero (*Ad Fam.*, III, 10, 9) indicates, no longer observed. Catulus could hardly have welcomed the son of his colleague in the consulship and bitter foe, M. Aemilius Lepidus, and Pompey's opponents, M. Lucullus and Q. Metellus Creticus, could scarcely have viewed with resignation the election of Pompey's quaestor M. Aemilius Scaurus. A strain—already perceptible after Caesar entered on his "popular" course—must have developed at the pontifical dinners magnificently provided by the state at public festivals. A fundamental lack of harmony must have characterized the meetings of the body held to consider religious questions referred to them by the senate. And that lack of harmony may have contributed to the decadence of the state religion which Altheim attributes in part to the popular election of priests.

This paper has examined the membership in the pontifical college from the coöptation of Caesar in 74-3 to his death in 44. Cicero's list of the members in 57 has been shown to be arranged

places open to them, and that in general in the years 63-50 the election went in favor of the old nobility. Cicero, who in 53 or 52 obtained the place of P. Crassus in the augurate, is the only new man in the list of augurs of 50, and he had to wait ten years after his consulship to secure the priesthood which made him, as he had long desired to be, a colleague of Pompey. In the years 74-44 pontifices and augurs were recruited from many of the same families—for instance from the patrician Corneli Lentuli, Iulii Caesares, Sulpicii Galbae, and Valerii Messallae, and from the plebeian Caecilii Metelli, Licinii Crassi, Licinii Luculli, Mucii Scaevolae, and Servilii Vatae.

⁸⁴ Horace, *Sat.*, I, 6, 29.

in order of entrance into the college. Metellus Pius' earlier list seems to be based on a similar principle. It has been possible to date between the years 74 and 69 the dinner which he describes and to compile a roll of twelve members of the college in that period. Nine members of the college which coöpted Caesar into membership can be determined. Although patricians may have been at a disadvantage in elections under the *Lex Domitia*, they were eligible for some of the new places created by Sulla, and they suffered no restrictions under the *Lex Labiena*. After 49 Caesar at times disregarded the status of candidates in filling vacancies. The names of the men elected after the *Lex Labiena* show that the priesthoods in general continued to be the prerogative of the old nobility, though the lack of harmony produced by the election of men not on good terms with members of the college may have contributed to the decline of the state religion.

If my interpretation of these lists is convincing, this study has provided prosopographical material of some importance for the careers of a number of men in the late Republic. I append a list of the pontifices with the date or approximate date of their coöptation and death and, where there is evidence, the names of their predecessors. The numbers in parentheses which follow the names of the pontifices refer to the articles (under the *gens*) in the *Real-Encyclopaedie*.

PONTIFICES, FLAMINES, AND REGES SACRORUM

<i>Name</i>		<i>Coöptation or Inauguration</i>	<i>Death</i>
Q. Caecilius Metellus Pius	cos. 80 (98)	before 88, P. M. 81	64-3
Q. Lutatius Catulus	cos. 78 (8)	before 88 ?	61-60
C. Aurelius Cotta	cos. 75 (96)	before 90	74-3
? Mam. Aemilius Lepidus Livianus			
	cos. 77 (80)	before 88 ?	before 60
P. Servilius Vatia Isauricus	cos. 79 (93)	before 76	44
M. Terentius Varro Lucullus	cos. 73	before 76	56-54
	(Licinius 109)		
Q. Caecilius Metellus Creticus	cos. 69 (87)	before 76	54-50
M. Acilius Glabrio	cos. 67 (38)	before 76	57-54
M. Valerius Messalla	cos. 61	ca. 79-6	
D. Iunius Silanus	cos. 62 (163)	76-74	61-60 ?
C. Iulius Caesar	cos. 59 (131)	74-3, P. M. 63	44
Successor of C. Aurelius Cotta			
Rex sacrorum		74-69	ca. 62
P. Mucius Scaevola	(18)	74-69	ca. 64-3?
Sextus (Quintilius Varus?)		74-69	before 60
Flamen Martialis, L. Cornelius Lentulus			
	cand. for cos. 58 (234)	74-69	56
P. Sulpicius Galba	cand. for cos. 63 (55)	ca. 69	

<i>Name</i>		<i>Coöptation or Inauguration</i>	<i>Death</i>
Q. Caecilius Metellus Scipio	cos. 52 (99)	64-3	46
Successor of Q. Metellus Pius?			
C. Fannius	tr. pl. 59, pr. 55? (9)	64-3?	48?
Successor of P. Scaevola?			
M. Aemilius Lepidus			
	cos. 46, IIIvir r. p. e. 42 (73)	62?, P. M. 44	13
P. Cornelius Lentulus Spinther	cos. 57 (238)	62, 60, or 59	47-6
Rex sacrorum, L. ? Claudius	(21)	62-60	
M. Aemilius Scaurus	cand. for cos. 53 (141)	60?	exiled 52
M. Licinius Crassus	cos. 70 and 55 (68)	60?	53
or			
M. Licinius Crassus,	quaes. 54 (56)	60?	49-8
Successor of Catulus or Silanus			
C. Scribonius Curio	cos. 76 (10)	60?	53
Successor of Catulus or Silanus			
Flamen Quirinalis, Sex. Iulius Caesar			
	quaes. 47? (152, 153)	60-58	46
L. Pinarius Natta		58	56?
Q. Caepio Brutus	pr. 44 (Iunius 53)	56-50	42
L. Domitius Ahenobarbus	cos. 54 (27)	56-51	48
C. Scribonius Curio	tr. pl. 50 (11)	52-1	49
Successor of elder Curio?			
Ti. Claudius Nero	pr. 42 (254)	47	33?
Successor of Metellus Scipio			
C. Octavius (Augustus)	(Julius 132)	48-47, P. M. 12	14 A. D.
Successor of L. Domitius			
Cn. Domitius Calvinus	cos. 53 (43)	before 44	after 36
C. Antonius	pr. 44 (20)	before 44	42

PONTIFICES MINORES

Q. Cornelius	before 74-69	after 57
P. Volumnius	before 74-69	before 57
P. Albinovanus	before 74-69	after 57
Q. Terentius	after 74-69	after 57
Successor of P. Volumnius		

LILY ROSS TAYLOR.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE.

THE TRIBE PTOLEMAIS.

Date of Creation.¹ Dates suggested for the creation of Ptolemais have varied from the time of the Chremonidean War to 222/1 B. C.² Recently, the investigations of Ferguson and Dinsmoor, in particular, have narrowed the limits of the controversy to a date between 226/5 and 222/1; Dinsmoor now posits a date in 226/5, Ferguson in 224/3 or 223/2.³

¹ As in the case of Hadrianis later, Ptolemais was made the seventh in order of thirteen tribes. This position was not occasioned by any effort to bring the tribe into relation with the intercalary month, as Bates (*The Five Post-Kleisthenean Tribes*, p. 32) has suggested. In this connection, see A. B. Cook, *Zeus*, II, p. 1137; P. Graindor, *Athènes sous Hadrien*, p. 18; and J. Kirchner *ad I. G.*, II², 3286 and 3287. For the priest who administered the cult of the new eponymos, see *I. G.*, II², 4676; Ferguson, *Hell. Athens*, p. 242; Treves, *Les Études Classiques*, IX (1940), p. 147; and Pritchett, *Hesperia*, X (1941), p. 397. The cults of the other post-Kleisthenean eponymoi were similarly administered. For Antigonos and Demetrios, see Ferguson, *op. cit.*, p. 126, note 1; K. Scott, *A. J. P.*, XLIX (1928), pp. 140-141; W. B. Dinsmoor, *Archons of Athens*, pp. 14-15; Kirchner *ad I. G.*, II², 3424; and A. Wilhelm, *Ἀρχ. Ἐφ.*, 1937, pp. 203-207. For Attalos, see Ferguson, *op. cit.*, p. 271, note 2; and *I. G.*, II², 5080. For Hadrian, see *I. G.*, II², 3295-3298, 5038; and P. Graindor, *op. cit.*, pp. 103 and 168-169.

The office of the priest of the eponymos has been the subject for much recent discussion. R. Schlaifer (*Harvard Studies in Cl. Phil.*, LI [1940], pp. 251-257) has rightly established that the priesthoods of various eponymoi were controlled by the gene or families which regulated the cults and sanctuaries of these heroes. The priests, accordingly, might or might not be members of the tribes whose eponymoi they served. This same rule of cult control, we now see, was continued in the case of the priesthoods of the post-Kleisthenean eponymoi. There is, therefore, no reason to suppose that this control was gradually transferred from the gene or participating families to the tribes, and none of the evidence which Schlaifer adduces in favor of his so-called "non-gentile" theory seems to me conclusive. Control of the worship of the eponymoi was throughout in the hands of the cults.

² See W. B. Dinsmoor, *Archons of Athens*, pp. 189 ff., and S. Dow, *Hesperia*, II (1933), pp. 430-432.

³ For recent literature, see Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.*, IV, 2, p. 93; S. Dow, *Hesperia*, III (1934), p. 181; Ferguson, *Athenian Tribal Cycles*, pp. 90-96; W. B. Dinsmoor, *List*, pp. 160-161, 232; Pritchett, *A. J. P.*, LXI (1940), pp. 460-468. Cf. Tarn, *C. A. H.*, VII, pp. 758 and 864; Robert, *Études Epigraphiques et Philologiques*, p. 69; and Treves, *Les Études Classiques*, IX (1940), p. 147. All are agreed that the order of thesmo-

In the great archon-list *I. G.*, II², 1706, for the text of which reference is made to Dow's exhaustive study in *Hesperia*, II (1933), plate XIV, the nine annual archons, taken from different tribes, are inscribed in their order of rank. In the case of the six otherwise equal thesmothetai, this rank is determined by the official order of the tribes. At the time of Dow's study of the text, it was still considered permissible to assume some duplication of tribes within any given year.⁴ The difficulties have resulted from limited knowledge of the demes of the two Macedonian tribes, and the assumption of irregularities in II², 1706 may be dispelled in great part as a result of new information concerning the tribal affiliations of the demes Phyle, Atene, and Anakaia.⁵ In the light of this information, the tribal representations for the archons listed in II², 1706 are given in the table on p. 415 which is reproduced essentially from Pritchett and Meritt, *The Chronology of Hellenistic Athens*, p. 44. Arabic numbers are used to refer to the twelve tribes, numbering from Antigonis to Antiochis. Ptolemais, which became the seventh tribe in official order, is indicated by the letter P.

This table, as now constituted, reveals only one irregularity, the order of the thesmothetai in the year of Antiphilos (224/3). The deme of the third thesmothetes, whose name was inscribed between representatives from tribes III and VI, was Athmonon. This is known to have been a part of Kekropis (IX), and no theory of a divided deme will remove the irregularity.

To the problems of the date of the creation of Ptolemais, the evidence of this archon-table makes a very important contribution: the thesmothetai in the years preceding Antiphilos (224/3) are in order only if Ptolemais did not then exist. In the year of Niketes (225/4), the existence of Ptolemais would result in a

thetai in *I. G.*, II², 1706, lines 95-100 requires a date before the archonship of Menekrates (220/19), and, indeed, the death of Ptolemy Euergetes and Berenike a date before 221.

⁴ See, in particular, the table in *Hesperia*, III (1934), p. 177.

⁵ See the summary in *A. J. P.*, LXI (1940), pp. 186-193. To the evidence there cited (p. 190) for the assignment of Atene to Demetrias may be added II², 727, line 4. In this inscription, the chairman of the proedroi was from Atene, the first and second symproedroi from the tribes Erechtheis (III) and Aigeis (IV). This order indicates that the chairman must have been from one of the first two tribes, i. e., Demetrias (II), and the prytanizing tribe at the time of the passage of the decree must have been the other, Antigonis (I).

change of order from 2, 4, 7, 8, 9, 12, as given in the table below, to 2, 4, 8, 9, 7, 13. Far from hesitating to accept such a change with its resultant irregular order, Dinsmoor expresses his en-

TABLE

Year	Archon	Phylai of			Phylai of					
		Archon	King	Polemarch	Thesmothetai					
<i>I. G., II², 1706 (Hesperia, II [1933], plate XIV)</i>										
230/29										
229/8	[Heliodoros]	2	8	7	4	5	6	10	11	12
228/7	Leochares	12	5	2	1	4	7	9	10	11
227/6	Theophilos	10	11	8	2	3	5	6	9	12
226/5	Ergochares	7	[4/12]	6	1	2	3	9	10	11
225/4	Niketes	6	10	1 or 3	2	4	7	8	9	12
224/3	Antiphilos	11	2	12	1	3	9	6	7 ^a	
223/2	[- ^{9½} -]									
222/1	[Archelaos]									
221/0	[Thrasyphon]	[2 ⁷]			[1]	[3]	4	8	10	11
220/19	Menekrates	8	9	12	1	2	4	6	P	11
219/8	Chairephon	12	4	11	1 or 2 ^a					
218/7	[Kalli --]									
217/6	[---]								11	12
216/5	Hagnias	4	7	6	2	3	5	P	9	11
215/4	Diokles	1	5	2	4	P	7	8	9	12
214/3	Euphiletos	5	10	8	1	3	P	9	11	12
213/2	Herakleitos	9						7		10?

dorsement of it because this disarrangement would find an explanation in the creation of Ptolemais. He states,⁹ "it might be inferred that Ptolemais was created just before" the archonship of Antiphilos (224/3), "and that the disturbance was caused by

* The first letter of the demotic of the fifth thesmothetes (line 59) appears to be a pi. The second letter is quite uncertain; if an epsilon, as Dow (*Hesperia*, II [1933], p. 444) prefers, the demotic was probably Περὶ τοὶ δῆμος. The distribution of archons in 224/3 would then be: 11, 2, 12, 1, 3, 9, 6, 8, 10. The fourth thesmothetes is frequently spoken of as being the one out of order (Dinsmoor, *Archons*, p. 463; Dow, *Hesperia*, II [1933], p. 444); if it was a year in the epoch of the twelve tribes, it must have been the third thesmothetes.

⁷ For a possible demotic, see Dow, *Hesperia*, II (1933), p. 444; A. J. A., XL (1936), pp. 59-62, 70. Cf. Dinsmoor, A. J. P., LXI (1940), p. 461.

⁸ Cf. A. J. P., LXI (1940), p. 189.

⁹ *Archons*, p. 463. Cf. *List*, p. 161, and A. J. P., LXI (1940), p. 462.

the insertion of the new tribe. But a disturbance of order caused by this political change might have lasted two years as well as one. Thus we could equally well say that Ptolemais was created just before "the archonship of Niketes (225/4).¹⁰ But it must be noted that the disarrangement in the year of Antiphilos was not caused by a political change; it is of a clerical sort and is not comparable, for example, to a tribal duplication which would be the product of the electoral machinery.¹¹ The stonecutter's style is identical throughout the monument, and it must have been inscribed and erected after the last archons on the list, those for the year 213/2, were chosen. One error of a clerical sort affords no evidence for the assumption of error resulting from political change.

Another approach for dating the creation of Ptolemais has been attempted through efforts to determine a break in the cycle of archons listed in *I. G.*, II², 1706. Since the phylai to hold the three senior archonships were allotted *κατὰ φυλάς* for twelve (or thirteen) years, no duplication of phylai was permitted for any one archonship in a cycle.¹² When Ferguson wrote his *Athenian Tribal Cycles*, it was thought that the polemarchs of 228/7 and 227/6 were from the same tribe, Oineis (VIII), and, accordingly, that the year 227/6 was the beginning of a cycle. Ferguson also assumed that the tribe Antiochis was allotted the office of polemarch in the archonships of Antiphilos and Menekrates, dated by him in 224/3 and 222/1, respectively.¹³ It followed that there was a break in the cycles between these two years, and it was logical to assume that the break was caused by the introduction of Ptolemais.

Now, however, we know that the best interpretation of the evidence, based on recent Agora discoveries,¹⁴ is that the polemarch of 228/7 came from the second tribe, Demetrias, and that the polemarchs came from Antiochis both in 224/3 and in 220/19.

¹⁰ In similar fashion, Ferguson (*Cycles*, p. 92) has reasoned that the confusion of demes in Antiphilos' year would find a natural explanation if Ptolemais was created in its course.

¹¹ Cf. Dow, *Hesperia*, III (1934), pp. 180 and 188.

¹² See Ferguson, *Cycles*, pp. 50-54.

¹³ *Op. cit.*, pp. 50 and 53.

¹⁴ Meritt, *Hesperia*, IX (1940), p. 76, and Pritchett, *A. J. P.*, LXI (1940), p. 190. Cf. Dinsmoor, *A. J. P.*, LXI (1940), pp. 465-466, and Pritchett-Meritt, *Chronology*, pp. 44-45.

It is no longer necessary to assume that a new cycle began in 227/6 and that a break occurred in one of the four years after 224/3; a new cycle did begin after 224/3, but there is no justification for assuming that this constituted a break.¹⁵ On the contrary, not only Dinsmoor in *A. J. P.*, LXI (1940), pp. 460-469, but also Pritchett and Meritt in *Chronology*, p. 45, now recognize one of the years after 224/3 as a natural terminus for a completed archon-cycle. Pritchett and Meritt, in presenting their archon-table, have noted that by rotating backward by two cycles the beginning of an archon-cycle would fall in 247/6, or in one of the three succeeding years. A break in the cycles of the secretaries of the Council and of the priests of Asklepios is known to have occurred in the year of Diomedon (247/6); so they begin a new archon-cycle at the same time and determine the date of a beginning two cycles later in 223/2.

But all this throws no light whatever on the date of creation of Ptolemais. Inasmuch as there is no break in the archon-cycle in the twenties, it is no longer possible to utilize the evidence of a break to date the creation of the new tribe. Nor does the end of the archon-list *I. G.*, II², 1706 in 213/2 have any connection with the span of the archon-cycle, whether broken or not, for this year was fixed for the end of the list by the fact that it was the end of a secretary-cycle, and it is now known that such lists as *I. G.*, II², 1706 were determined at the end and/or beginning by cycles of the secretaries of the Council.¹⁶

One may claim that the evidence of II², 1706, because of the order of thethesmothetai in 225/4, supports a date in 224/3 or after for the creation of Ptolemais. It proves a date for Ptolemais earlier than 220/19, because of the order of thethesmothetai in the archonship of Menekrates, but this evidence is less significant. The new tribe must have been created in any case before the death of Ptolemy Euergetes and Berenike in 221.

Dinsmoor, on the other hand, in accord with his theory that Ptolemais was created, not in 224/3 or later, but shortly after the beginning of 226/5, has observed that the Egyptian tribe should be expected to hold each of the three chief offices before

¹⁵ Hence, Pritchett (*A. J. P.*, LXI [1940], p. 193, note 23) is incorrect in referring to a "break in the archontes' cycle" between 224/3 and 220/19. Cf. Dinsmoor, *A. J. P.*, LXI (1940), p. 466.

¹⁶ Cf. Pritchett-Meritt, *op. cit.*, pp. 31-46.

the termination of the current archon-cycle. Since *I. G.*, II², 1706 demonstrates that the first of the chief archons who may be assigned to Ptolemais is the archon eponymos of 224/3, he was forced to conclude that the cycle continued for three years after 224 with the king and polemarch coming from this tribe in 223/2 and 222/1 respectively.¹⁷ By rotating back from 222/1 by two archon-cycles of 13 and 12 years, Dinsmoor then finds that a cycle began in 246/5, in the archonship of Diomedon, which is the year of a break in the secretary-cycle and so an appropriate time for a new archon-cycle to commence.

One trouble with this analysis is that Diomedon should be dated not in 246/5, but in 247/6;¹⁸ so the second cycle of archons cannot be made to end later than 223/2, and the three major archonships of Ptolemais cannot be compressed into the two years 224/3 and 223/2 without duplication. A more fundamental difficulty is that the hypothesis of necessary representation by Ptolemais before the end of an archon-cycle is, *ab initio*, completely without foundation. If the new tribe was created in 224/3, then its allotment to the various archonships was precisely on a par with all the other tribes for the new cycle which began in 223/2. But surely the cycle as such had nothing to do with the creation of the tribe; it can only reflect the accomplished fact, and there is no evidence from *I. G.*, II², 1706 to indicate that Ptolemais was functioning before 220/19.

For Dinsmoor's theory that Ptolemais was created in the second prytany of the year of Ergochares (226/5), there remains for consideration his interpretation of the calendar requirements of this year.¹⁹ In his *List*, Dinsmoor's calendar scheme for 226/5 is determined from two inscriptions which give the following equations, as ascertained by Meritt and accepted by Dinsmoor:

I. G., II², 838

Μεταγειτνῶνος ἐνάτ[η μετ' εἰκάδας δ]ευτέραι ἐμβολίμωι = Prytany III, 20.

Hesperia, IV (1935), no. 39²⁰

Μεταγειτνῶνος δευτέραι μετ' εἰκάδας = Prytany III, 27.

¹⁷ *A. J. P.*, LXI (1940), pp. 460-468.

¹⁸ Pritchett-Meritt, *op. cit.*, pp. 28-34.

¹⁹ *Archons*, pp. 193-195; *List*, pp. 160-161, 231-232; *A. J. P.*, LXI (1940), p. 466.

²⁰ For the most recent text of this inscription, see Hiller von Gaertringen, *I. G.*, XII, supplement, pp. 200-201.

The two inscriptions are dated only seven days apart, and Meritt has shown that they clearly demonstrate the use of backward count with the phrase μετ' εικάδας.²¹ Dinsmoor interprets the phrase δευτέραι ἐμβολίμωι in *I. G.*, II², 838 as meaning an intercalary month and obtains the two equations Metageitnion II, 22 = Prytany III, 20 and Metageitnion (II), 29 = Prytany III, 27. The phrase ἐνάτη μετ' εικάδας in line 5 of *Hesperia*, IV (1935), no. 39 indicates that Metageitnion (II) was a full month;²² so Hekatombaion was full and the second month hollow. According to Dinsmoor's scheme, then, the two inscriptions were passed on the 81st and 88th days of the year. Dinsmoor, following Kirchner, computes that if the year of Ergochaeres was within the period of twelve tribes, there must have been thirty days in the first prytany, thirty-one days in the second, thirty-two days in each of seven others, and thirty-three days in the three remaining prytanies. He notes that in comparison with the normal scheme for an intercalary year there are two deficiencies, one of two days in the first prytany and the other of one day in the second.²³ On the other hand, if the year began as ordinary during the period of twelve tribes with thirty days in the first prytany and thirty-one days in the second and then was changed to an intercalary year of thirteen tribes with thirty days in four and twenty-nine days in seven remaining prytanies, there would be only one irregularity—the excess of one day in the second prytany.²⁴ Without pointing to other irregular months which were intercalated without the justification of tribal changes²⁵ and to other conciliar years which contained even greater irregularities in the length of prytanies,²⁶ it is necessary to make one correction in Dinsmoor's interpretation: the phrase δευτέραι ἐμβολίμωι refers not to an intercalated

²¹ *Hesperia*, IV (1935), pp. 530-531.

²² See Meritt, *loc. cit.*, p. 535.

²³ *List*, pp. 160-161.

²⁴ Dinsmoor (*List*, p. 232) attributes this to the delay in starting the system. The excess of one day, therefore, is required for the second prytany; so Dinsmoor elsewhere (p. 160) should not assign 31 days to the first prytany.

²⁵ Cf. Ferguson, *Cycles*, p. 92, and Dinsmoor, *List*, in Index s. vv. Intercalary months.

²⁶ Cf., e. g., Dow, *Prytaneis*, pp. 122-123, and Pritchett-Meritt, *op. cit.*, p. 102.

month,²⁷ but to the specified day.²⁸ The intercalated month was a second Hekatombaion,²⁹ and the phrase Μεταγειτνιώνος ἐνάτ[η μετ' εἰκάδας δ]ευτέρα ἐμβολίμῳ means an intercalated Metageitnion 22.³⁰ The month Metageitnion contained thirty-one days, and the first two prytanies comprised sixty-two days. So, a comparison of Dinsmoor's system with the orthodox arrangement results in an *impasse*, for in Dinsmoor's system there would be an excess of two days in the first two prytanies or in the orthodox system a deficiency of the same number.

There is, however, a third calendar equation of this year contained in an unpublished Agora prytany inscription discovered on March 7, 1936, and duly reported by Shear.³¹ This new inscription, although not complete, provides a most fortunate control over the two systems. It contains a calendar formula which equates the eighth day of a month, the name of which is broken away, with the second or twenty-second day of an undetermined prytany.³² When a table is drawn up in which the days of the calendar months are equated with the days of the various prytanies as constituted according to both the orthodox and Dinsmoor's systems, it is found that the two days preserved in the new equation coincide only in the orthodox arrangement. One is warranted in claiming this as strong corroboration of the orthodox theory which regards Ergochaes' year as being in the period of twelve tribes.

To facilitate computation, a table is given below in which the

²⁷ Kirchner, *ad I. G.*, II², 838 and 946; Klaffenbach, *Gnomon*, 1926, p. 709; Dinsmoor, *Archons*, pp. 194, 378-379; *List*, pp. 215-216; Meritt, *Hesperia*, IV (1935), pp. 529-532, 537.

²⁸ See Pritchett-Meritt, *Chronology*, pp. 14-15.

²⁹ West, *Classical Studies Presented to Edward Capps*, p. 359.

³⁰ This seems preferable to West's interpretation that there were two intercalated days; see in particular Usener, *Kleine Schriften*, III, pp. 486-487. Cf. Pritchett-Meritt, *op. cit.*, p. 15, note 53. Another extra day in the civil calendar, however, would reduce the deficiency of the first two prytanies according to the orthodox system to one day and would not alter in any essential the results given below.

³¹ Agora Excavations 1936, Weekly Report, Sixth Week. Thanks are here offered to T. L. Shear and B. D. Meritt for permission to include the Agora inscription in this publication.

³² Restoration of the thirty-second day in the lacuna of line 3 would give to this line 52 letter-spaces and make it longer than any other line of the prescript. In Dinsmoor's system, of course, there is no thirty-second day in any prytany.

eighth day of each of the thirteen months is equated with the day of the year on which it should fall. It is to be noted that the number of the day within the year may be decreased by one in case of the substitution of a hollow month for a full one to compensate for the excessive day in Metageitnion: ³³

TABLE

Month		Day of Year
Hekatombaion	+ (30)	8 = 8
Hekatombaion II	— (29)	8 = 38
Metageitnion	+ (31)	8 = 67
Boedromion	—	8 = 98
Pyanopsion	+	8 = 127
Maimakterion	—	8 = 157
Posideon	+	8 = 186
Gamelion	—	8 = 216
Anthesterion	+	8 = 245
Elaphebolion	—	8 = 275
Mounichion	+	8 = 304
Thargelion	—	8 = 334
Skirophorion	—	8 = 363

According to Dinsmoor's scheme for the length of prytanies, one may divide the last eleven prytanies in several ways: the seven twenty-nine-day prytanies first, the four thirty-day prytanies first, or any alternation of seven twenty-nine and four thirty-day prytanies. Our computation reveals that neither the second nor the twenty-second day of any of these prytanies, variously arranged, can be equated with the eighth day of any calendar month. Nor is the result different if we make the correction of one day as required by the phrase *δευτέραι ἐμβολίμωι*. Dinsmoor's theory of thirteen prytanies is not sustained.

On the other hand, if one assumes that the year contained only twelve prytanies with the last ten prytanies so divided that Prytanies III-V contained thirty-two days each, VI-IX thirty-

³³ Dinsmoor has assumed a similar sequence of hollow months in *Archons*, pp. 434, 437, and 439. In the first example, which occurs in the archonship of Kallimedes, a new date for this archon makes this assumption no longer necessary, for Hekatombaion of this year may be regarded as a hollow month; cf. Kirchner, *ad I. G.*, II³, 777. A new summary of the arrangement of the calendar, made in the light of recent discoveries concerning the calendar and archons, is needed to replace, in part, *Archons*, pp. 424-440.

two and thirty-three days alternately, and X-XII thirty-two days, it is found that Prytany VIII, 22 would fall on the 245th day of the year, which according to the civil calendar would be Anthesterion 8.³⁴

The inscription is a fragment of Pentelic marble, found in a Byzantine wall in Section N on March 7, 1936. The original top, back, and left side are preserved.

Height, 0.35 m.; width, 0.23 m.; thickness, 0.10 m.

Height of letters, 0.006 m.

Agora Inv. No. I 3684.

Aiantis

226/5 B. C.

ca. 50

- [Ε]πὶ Ἐργοχάρου ἀρχοντ[ος ἐπὶ τῆς Αἰαντίδος ὀγδότης πρυτανείας]
 ἤι Ζωῖλος Διφίλου Ἄλωπ[εκῆθεν ἐγραμμάτευεν· Ἀνθεστηριῶνος]
 ὀγδοὶ ἱσταμένου, δευτ[έραι καὶ εἰκοστὴ τῆς πρυτανείας· ἐκκλησί]
 α ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ· τῶν προέδ[ρων ἐπεψήφισεν —^{ca. 15}— Φα]
 5 ληρεὺς καὶ συμπρόεδροι ἔδ[οξεν τῷ δήμῳ vacat — — —]
 Μενεκλέους Ἀφιδναῖος εἶπ[εν· ὑπὲρ ὧν ἀπαγγέλλουσιν οἱ πρυτάνεις]
 τῆς Αἰαντίδος ὑπὲρ τῶν ἱερ[ῶν ὧν ἔθνον τὰ πρὸ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τῷ τε]
 Ἀπόλλωνι τῷ Προστατηρί[ῳ καὶ τεῖ Ἀρτέμιδι τεῖ Βουλαίαι καὶ τοῖς]
 ἄλλοις θεοῖς οἷς πάτριον [ἦν, ἐπεμελήθησαν δὲ καὶ τῆς συλλογῆς τῆς]
 10 βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου καὶ τ[ῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων ὧν αὐτοῖς προσέταττον οἱ]
 τε νόμοι καὶ τὰ ψήφισματ[α τοῦ δήμου, ἐπαινέσαι τοὺς πρυτάνεις]
 τῆς Αἰαντίδος καὶ στεφ[ανῶσαι χρυσῶι στεφάνῳ κατὰ τὸν νόμον εὖσε]
 βείας ἔνεκα τῆς πρὸς το[ῦς θεοῦς καὶ φιλοτιμίας τῆς εἰς τὴν βουλήν καὶ]
 τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ἀθηναί[ων· ἀναγράψαι δὲ τόδε τὸ ψήφισμα τὸν γραμμα]
 15 τέα τὸν κατὰ πρυτ[ανείαν ἐν στήλει λιθίνει καὶ στήσαι ἐν τῷ πρυτανί]
 κῶι· εἰς δὲ τὴν ἀ[ναγραφὴν τῆς στήλης μερίσαι τὸν ἐπὶ τεῖ διοικήσει]
 τὸ γινόμενον[ν ἀνάλωμα. vacat]
 vacat

³⁴ In accord with the Kirchner-Dinsmoor interpretation of the phrase δευτέραι ἐμβολίμῳ, the orthodox theory would provide two days which might be restored in the new inscription: the 127th day of the year on which would fall Pyanopsion 8 and Prytany V, 2, and the 244th day with Anthesterion 8 and Prytany VIII, 22. In the former case, it would be necessary to assume that Metageitnion II and Boedromion were both full. The text of lines 2-3 would be:

ἤι Ζωῖλος Διφίλου Ἄλωπ[εκῆθεν ἐγραμμάτευεν· Πυανοψιῶνος]
 ὀγδοὶ ἱσταμένου, δευτ[έραι τῆς πρυτανείας· ἐκκλησία κυρί]

In line 1 a prytanizing tribe other than Aiantis would be required.

A new *terminus ante quem* for the creation of Ptolemais is provided by an inscription from the year 223/2. *I. G.*, II², 917, which names a secretary from Kedoi belonging to the tribe Erechtheis, has been assigned by the requirements of the secretary-cycle and of prosopography to this year.³⁵ The two calendar equations contained in this inscription show that part of the seventh prytany falls in Posideon and that the inscription must be dated in the period of the thirteen tribes.³⁶

Ferguson and Dow have recently published a new text of *I. G.*, II², 1303, which alludes in line 12 to the policy of Athens in the year 224/3: [τεῖ] τοῦ δήμου προαίρε[σε]ι τιμᾶν τῷ[ν β]ασ[ι]λ[έα].³⁷ After the Achaean League accepted the alliance with Antigonos Doson, Athens under the leadership of Eurykleides and Mikion arose to the necessity of cultivating the friendship of Ptolemy III.³⁸ At this same time, the Aitolians became anxious about their neutrality and began courting Egypt.³⁹ It seems probable that Athens' policy became operative in 224/3 with the Ptolemaia being celebrated in this year⁴⁰ and with the functioning of Ptolemais as an official tribe at the end of the year.

Assignment of Demes. The number of demes to be assigned to the Egyptian tribe depends in part upon the reading for the deme-list inscribed in the year 201/0 during the short period of the eleven tribes.⁴¹ Independent readings of this stone, now published as *I. G.*, II², 2362 and bearing the Epigraphical Museum

³⁵ Dow, *A. J. A.*, XL (1936), pp. 57-60; *Prytaneis*, pp. 76-77; Meritt, *Hesperia*, VII (1938), p. 137; Pritchett, *Hesperia*, IX (1940), pp. 116-118; Pritchett-Meritt, *Chronology*, pp. 101-102.

³⁶ Cf. Dinsmoor, *List*, p. 234.

³⁷ *Hesperia*, II (1933), pp. 447-449.

³⁸ Ferguson (*Cycles*, p. 93) states: "The creation of Ptolemais is unintelligible without a commitment on Athens' part to the king of Egypt."

³⁹ Flacelière, *Les Aitoliens à Delphes*, p. 258. The dedication of statues to Ptolemy Euergetes and his family by the Aitolians (*I. G.*, IX, 1², 56) is assigned to this year by Tarn (*C. A. H.*, VII, p. 758), although Flacelière (*op. cit.*, p. 269, note 1) indicates other possibilities.

⁴⁰ Concerning the inauguration of the Ptolemaia in the winter of 224/3, the best treatment is that of Ferguson, *Klio*, VIII (1908), pp. 338-345. Cf. *Hesperia*, II (1933), p. 448, lines 6-12.

⁴¹ Three of the demes of Ptolemais (Hyporeia, Klopidae, and Petalidae) do not receive separate articles in Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopädie*.

number 8037, have been made by Pittakys in 1840 (Ἐφ. Ἀρχ., no. 410), Ross in 1846 (*Die Deme von Attika*, pp. 1-15), Koehler (*I. G.*, II, 991), and Lolling and Kirchner (*I. G.*, II², 2362). The total number of lines per column in this inscription can be estimated at forty-two. Above line 27, which is the fourth line of column II, as numbered in the text published by Kirchner in the *editio minor*, there must have been inscribed two demes of Pandionis in addition to the heading, making a total of seven demes of Pandionis at the top of column II.⁴² Therefore, at the bottom of column I, there must have been space for the five remaining demes of Pandionis (or four, if Paiania was inscribed as one deme), the name of the tribe, and the ten names of the remaining demes of Aigeis—all inscribed below the last preserved line of column I (line 26). This gives a total of 42 lines for column I. Below the twenty-fifth line of the second column, there must have been inscribed the three remaining demes of the fourth tribe, Leontis, followed by the name of the fifth tribe, Ptolemais, in line 29. This leaves thirteen lines at the bottom of column II and eleven lines in addition to the heading at the top of column III, for in the thirteenth line of column III is preserved the name Akamantis. Ptolemais, then, probably contained twenty-four demes in 201/0.⁴³

Two of the demes now assigned to Ptolemais owe their existence solely to readings first made in the text of this inscription by Koehler and published in *I. G.*, II, 991; there is no other evidence nor do the texts of editors earlier than Koehler include these readings. In lines 50 and 51, the readings ΕΔΩ and ΣΑ are given as the initial letters for demes of Ptolemais. Koehler's reading ΣΑ has been reprinted in the *editio minor*, although Koehler transcribed the sigma with broken lines. Schoeffer restored the deme as Salamis after Philostratos, *Her.*, 314.⁴⁴ Dinsmoor has shown that this restoration is historically impossible.⁴⁵ As a matter of fact, although squeezes now in the

⁴² Dinsmoor (*Archons*, p. 451, note 2) computes forty-three lines in column I by assigning thirteen instead of twelve demes to Pandionis. This probably resulted from the inclusion of Kaletea; cf. Dow, *Hesperia*, III (1934), p. 188. For Dow's estimate of the length of the columns, see *Hesperia*, III (1934), p. 176, note 1.

⁴³ Variations in the number of lines per column, as in the register of many prytany inscriptions, must be considered a possibility.

⁴⁴ Pauly-Wissowa, *R.-E.*, s. v. Δῆμοι, col. 99.

⁴⁵ *Archons*, p. 450.

Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton show the two strokes of the lambda, the markings which may have been read as the sigma are not in line with letters above and below. The epigraphical requirements suggest a kappa, and the reading Κλ[ωπίδαι], the name of a deme known to have belonged to Ptolemais in the later period, may be suggested.⁴⁶ In line 50, one would judge from the squeeze that there are many markings on the worn surface. Traces which Koehler and Lolling may have considered as evidence for the reading ΕΔΩ, though distinguishable, are not characteristic of the letter-forms of this inscription and may well be fortuitous strokes. Final judgment, however, must await an examination of the stone. These letters were not read by editors before Koehler, and their very uncertain existence may hardly be considered as evidence for an otherwise unattested deme.⁴⁷ In line 53, Kirchner cites Lolling as reading a rho in the fifth letter-space.⁴⁸ This letter must rather be assigned with certainty to the fourth letter-space, for it is above the rho of line 54. There is an iota in the fifth letter-space, and next is the diagonal of what may be an alpha. The name of the deme is to be restored as [Ἰκα]ρία.

Original Tribal Affiliation. Ptolemais was composed of demes taken from all the twelve tribes with the exception of Antigonis and Demetrias, the two Macedonian tribes.⁴⁹ There is evidence for the following original affiliation:

Original Tribe		Deme
Erechtheis	1	Themakos
Aigeis	2	Ikaria
		Kydantidai
Pandionis	1	Konthyle
Leontis	1	Hekale

⁴⁶ The existence of Klopidae as a separate deme is denied by Koehler (*ad I. G.*, II, 788) and Honigmann (Pauly-Wissowa, *R.-E.*, s. v. Kropia). They consider Κλωπίδαι as a vulgar form of Κρωπίδαι; cf. schol. to Aristophanes, *Equites*, 79. This is disproved by the separate tribal affiliation of the two, Klopidae being a part of Ptolemais and Kropidae of Leontis. Cf. Kirchner, *ad I. G.*, II², 1602 and 2041.

⁴⁷ See also Bates, *The Five Post-Kleisthenean Tribes*, p. 44, who, however, proposes to correct line 50 to Κλω[πίδαι], as Schoeffer also has suggested (Pauly-Wissowa, *R.-E.*, s. v. Δῆμοι, cols. 73-74).

⁴⁸ *Ad I. G.*, II², 2362.

⁴⁹ Cf. Bates, *op. cit.*, p. 44, and Dinsmoor, *Archons*, p. 451.

Original Tribe		Deme
Akamantis	1	Prospalta
Oineis	1 (or 2)	Boutadai (Perrhidai?) ⁵⁰
Kekropis	1	Phlya
Hippothontis	1	Oinoe
Aiantis	4 (or 3)	Aphidna Perrhidai (?) ⁵¹ Thyrgonidai Titakidai
Antiochis	5	Aigilia Kolone Melainai Pentele Semachidai

There remain six other demes which belonged to Ptolemais. Concerning any earlier tribal affiliation, nothing is known.⁵² Berenikidai, as Apollonieis of Attalis later, was created either outright or from some preëxisting deme or demes. Eunostidai, Hyporeia, and Klopidae appear first in *I. G.*, II², 2362 (201/0); there is no evidence of their existence before the time of Ptolemais. There remain Akyaia and Petalidai, which are included in the list of demes on the evidence of inscriptions which date from the middle of the second century after Christ. One may suggest that in the light of evidence from the fourth century Petalidai did not have a separate deme existence at least until the creation of Ptolemais. In *I. G.*, II², 1594, lines 46 and 48, the location of a piece of property is defined as 'Αφιδ. ἐν Πεταλίδωι. In another fourth-century inscription, a field is defined as situated 'Αφίδνησι ἐν Πεταλιδῶν.⁵³ The delimiting prepositional phrase indicates that Petalidai was a locality within the deme Aphidna.⁵⁴ Aphidna was transferred in 223 from Aiantis to

⁵⁰ For Perrhidai, see Dow, *Prytaneis*, p. 38, especially note 2 (Oineis); Pritchett, *A. J. P.*, LX (1939), pp. 258-259; Kirchner, *ad I. G.*, II², 5719; and Wrede, Pauly-Wissowa, *R.-E.*, s. v. Perrhidai (Aiantis).

⁵¹ See note 50 above.

⁵² Cf. Dittenberger, *Hermes*, IX (1875), pp. 413-414; Milchhöfer, *Untersuchungen über die Demeordnung des Kleisthenes* (in *Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Phil.-hist. Klasse, 1892), p. 40; and Schiff, Pauly-Wissowa, *R.-E.*, s. v. Eunostidai, col. 1134.

⁵³ *Hesperia*, V (1936), no. 10, line 155.

⁵⁴ Cf. Meritt's translation (*ad loc.*): "in Aphidnai in the district of the Petalidai." The reference is hardly to Aphidnai, possibly the inland trittys of the tribe Aiantis; cf. Kirchner *ad I. G.*, II², 5719.

Ptolemais; there is no evidence whether Petalidai was by that time a separate deme.⁵⁵

Trittys Division. Whether the principle of trittyes applied to the post-Kleisthenean tribes has been a matter of dispute.⁵⁶

⁵⁵ Concerning three demes of Hippothontis which are known only from the Roman period, compare Pritchett, *Hesperia*, IX (1940), p. 124. Concerning the number of demes in the fifth century, see Busolt, *Gr. Gesch.*, II², pp. 405-406; Busolt-Swoboda, *Gr. Staatskunde*, II, pp. 873-875; and Hommel, in Pauly-Wissowa, *R.-E.*, s. vv. Naukraria, cols. 1948-1949, and Trittyes, col. 359.

⁵⁶ Similarly, it is uncertain whether the original trittyes were more or less continuous areas within themselves or whether they included isolated demes, frequently referred to as *enclaves*. The question will not be settled until a thorough investigation for the sites of demes is undertaken in Attika. The principle of continuous areas has been strongly defended by Löper (*Ath. Mitt.*, XVII [1892], pp. 319-433; cf. Wade-Gery in *Mélanges Glotz*, II, p. 884). The theory of enclaves, on the other hand, has been held by Milchhöfer (*Ath. Mitt.*, XVIII [1893], pp. 300-301; in Pauly-Wissowa, *R.-E.*, s. vv. Atene, Azenia, and, especially, Attika, col. 2198), Wilamowitz (*Aristoteles und Athen*, II, pp. 148, 151-152, 158), and Bates (*The Five Post-Kleisthenean Tribes*, p. 47), and involves an emendation in the text of Strabo, IX, 398. Löper and v. Schoeffer (cf. Pauly-Wissowa, *R.-E.*, s. v. *Ἀῖνες*, col. 50) simultaneously proposed to emend 'Αῖνες (the reading of all codices according to Kramer; v. Schoeffer reports 'Αῖνες), usually corrected to 'Αῖνες, into 'Αῖνες, for otherwise the position in the text of Strabo would make the site of Azenia completely isolated from the other demes of Hippothontis. Wilamowitz, who by error assigns Azenia to Antiochis (*op. cit.*, II, p. 158), and Milchhöfer retain Cascorbi's correction of 'Αῖνες. Their analogy of Thorikos no longer applies, for the trittyes of Akamantis are now known (see Meritt, *Hesperia*, IX [1940], pp. 53-54), and there is no topographical discontinuity (see the map in Gomme's *Population of Athens* and compare Wrede, in Pauly-Wissowa, *R.-E.*, s. v. Thorikos, and Kirchner, *ad I. G.*, II², 6225). Milchhöfer (*Ath. Mitt.*, XVIII [1893], p. 301) also compares Kopros, but his identification of this deme is incorrect; see Honigsmann, in Pauly-Wissowa, *R.-E.*, s. v. As a possible *enclave*, there remains Probalinthos of the coastal trittys of Pandionis. This was the southernmost member of the ancient confederacy called the Tetrapolis. Milchhöfer, Bates (*op. cit.*, p. 47), Frazer (*Pausanias*, II, pp. 434, 441), Möbius (*Ath. Mitt.*, XLIX [1924], p. 10), Kirchner (*ad I. G.*, II², 7292), and Soteriades (*B. C. H.*, L [1926], pp. 540-541; *A. J. A.*, XXX [1926], p. 507; *Πρακτικά*, 1933, pp. 32-46; 1936, pp. 41-42, where Soteriades promises to make a complete report of the topography of this region) locate Probalinthos on the coast immediately to the south of Marathon. Cf. also Crosby, *Hesperia*, VI (1936), p. 456. Löper (*Ath. Mitt.*, XVII [1892], pp. 367-368), however, has argued that the original

Kirchner, following Löper, has recognized an arrangement according to trittyes in prytany inscriptions dated as late as A. D. 169/70.⁵⁷ In favor of this principle, one might point also to the period of military oligarchy at the opening of the third century when the expense of stelai was borne in part by the trittyarchoi, who as executive heads of the trittyes were concerned with military finance.⁵⁸ The principle of trittys-division, however, had lost its local significance as early as 307/6. When the post-Kleisthenean tribes were created, the reassigned demes, drawn from the three trittyes of the various tribes, were not grouped into contiguous regions.⁵⁹ Thus, among the coastal demes of Demetrias, as determined by their earlier trittys affiliation, are Atene and Thorai from the south of Attika, but Kothokidai and Phyle from the west. The so-called inland trittys of Ptolemais was composed in part of Aphidna in the north-east, Phlya in the central portion, and Prospalta in the south; the so-called coastal trittys of Attalis included Atene and Sounion in the south, but Oinoe near Marathon. Another point of consideration is the trittys as a unit of population in the time of the post-Kleisthenean tribes. If the bouleutic representation for the demes of Antigonis and Demetrias, as given in *A. J. P.*, LXI (1940), pp. 188-191, is approximately correct, the so-called coastal trittys of Antigonis and inland trittys of Demetrias were greatly outweighed. Similarly, if Berenikidai is correctly located

Tetrapolis extended over a considerable area (cf. Bekker, *Anecdota Graeca*, 259, s. v. *Ἐρακλία*) and that Probalinthos should be brought into connection with the coastal trittys of Pandionis. Löper is followed by Solders (*Die ausserstädtischen Kulte*, pp. 122-123) and J. H. Young (*Hesperia*, X [1941], p. 165). There is no decisive epigraphical evidence; cf. Hauvette-Besnault, *B. C. H.*, III (1879), p. 201. The coastal trittys of Leontis included the demes of Sounion and Phrearrioi in the southernmost part of Attika and Potamos Deiradiotes and Deiradiotes near the modern village of Keratea (see, e. g., P. Kastromenos, *Die Deme von Attika*, pp. 55-56; C. Blümel, *Ath. Mitt.*, LI [1926], p. 61; J. Kirchner *ad I. G.*, II², 5965; A. W. Gomme in his map in *Population of Athens*; S. Solders, *op. cit.*, p. 90). Thorikos of Akamantis apparently separated these two groups (Strabo, IX, 398-399), but the distance involved was not large and there is no problem of a single enclave.

⁵⁷ *Ad I. G.*, II², 1776. Cf. *Rhein. Mus.*, LIX (1904), pp. 300-301, and *ad I. G.*, II², 1152.

⁵⁸ See, in particular, Ferguson, *Class. Phil.*, XXIV (1929), pp. 16-17.

⁵⁹ Cf. Milchhöfer, *op. cit.*, pp. 40-41.

near Eleusis as a coastal deme,⁶⁰ the so-called town-trittys of Ptolemais would be noticeably deficient in representation.

Wilamowitz has argued that the institution of the trittys began to break down as early as 340 B. C.,⁶¹ and our inability to discover units of equal population or of contiguous territory in the so-called trittyes of the post-Kleisthenean tribes confirms this conclusion. Wilamowitz noted that the three *συλλογῆς τοῦ δήμου* praised in *I. G.*, II², 1749 (341/0) did not belong to different trittyes.⁶² Although prytany catalogues of the fourth century were frequently arranged according to trittyes and in at least one case the names of the trittyes were included in the catalogue, inscriptions of the third and following centuries which exhibit this arrangement are so few as to be exceptional. In the case of prytany inscriptions which included decrees, the principle of the precedence of the demes of the treasurer and the secretary of the prytaneis prevailed,⁶³ but the demes listed below these two show no trittys arrangement.

Evidence for Demes of Ptolemais.

Aigilia. From Antiochis. Coast-deme.

I. G., II², 972, line 5 (= *Prytaneis*, no. 80); 1008, lines 102-103; 1028, line 142; 1034, frag. *d*, line 6; 1036, line 44 (= Hutton, *B. S. A.*, XXI [1914-16], pp. 158-159); 1706, line 99; 2362, line 56.

Akyaia.

I. G., II², 2049, lines 52-53; 2067, line 75.

Aphidna. From Aiantis. Inland-deme.

Harpokration, *s. v.* *Θυργωνίδαι*. Hesychios, *s. v.* *Ἀφιδνα*. *I. G.*, II², 1006, lines 119-120; 1008, line 99; 1009, lines 80, 83-84; 1011, line 111; 1028, line 143; 1036, line 45 (= Hutton, *B. S. A.*, XXI [1914-16], pp. 158-159); 1043, lines 86, 87; 1706, lines 51, 138; 1717, line 10; 1755, line 7 (= *Prytaneis*, no. 99); 1963, line 58;

⁶⁰ Milchhöfer, in Pauly-Wissowa, *R.-E.*, *s. v.* Berenikidai.

⁶¹ *Aristoteles und Athen*, II, pp. 166-168; Hommel (*R.-E.*, *s. v.* Trittyes, cols. 361 and 364), has noted that the significance of trittyes began to decline as early as 403/2.

⁶² Cf. Busolt-Swoboda, *Gr. Staatskunde*, II, p. 973. The rejection by Koehler and Kirchner of the restoration *ἐπιμεληταί* in *I. G.*, II², 2824 on the ground that the honored men are not listed *κατὰ τριττύς* may be questioned. Earlier, however, in 346/5, the epimeletai of Aiantis were chosen one from each trittys (*Hesperia*, V [1936], no. 10, lines 168-170).

⁶³ See Dow, *Prytaneis*, pp. 14 and 28.

2336, line 192. *Prytaneis*, no. 49, lines 42-43. Pritchett-Meritt, *Chronology*, pp. 114-115, line 21 (= II², 916).

Berenikidai.⁶⁴

Examples are too numerous to list. See Schoeffer, in Pauly-Wissowa, *R.-E.*, s. v. *Δῆμοι*, cols. 51-54, and Bates, *op. cit.*, pp. 30-32.

Boutadai. From Oineis. Town-deme.

I. G., II², 1011, line 104; 2049, line 54; 2067, lines 65-66; 2122, line 21; 2207, lines 7, 8, 11; 2338, line 35.

Eunostidai.⁶⁵

I. G., II², 1036, line 37 (= Hutton, *loc. cit.*); 2067, line 76; 2103, line 113; 2362, line 55.

Hekale. From Leontis. Inland-deme.

I. G., II², 1008, line 95; 1034, frag. d, line 7; 1036, line 39 (= Hutton, *loc. cit.*); 2122, line 24. *Hesperia*, IV (1935), no. 37, line 119.

Hyporeia.

I. G., II², 2362, line 54. Cf. *I. G.*, II², 2068, lines 46-47.

Ikaria B. From Aigeis. Inland-deme.

I. G., II², 2107, line 24; 2362, line 53 (see above, p. 425); 2442, line 5.

Klopidai.

I. G., II², 2067, line 64; 2362, line 51 (see above, pp. 424 f.).

Kolone B. From Antiochis. Town-deme.

I. G., II², 1006, line 123; 2018, line 34; 2065, line 73; 2086, line 80; 2103, line 111; 2122, line 25.

Konthyle.⁶⁶ From Pandionis. Inland-deme.

Schol. to Aristophanes, *Vespae*, 233. *I. G.*, II², 2128, line 46.

Kydantidai. From Aigeis. Inland-deme.

Phrynichos in Stephanos Byz., s. v. Hesychios, s. v. *Hesperia*, IV (1935), no. 37, line 114 (= *I. G.*, II², 1960).

⁶⁴ The location of this large deme is uncertain. Milchhöfer (*Untersuchungen*, p. 40, note 1, and in Pauly-Wissowa, *R.-E.*, s. v. Berenikidai), on the evidence of the provenience of two inscriptions, has located it in the western part of Attika near Eleusis. Cf. Kirchner, *ad I. G.*, II², 5868.

⁶⁵ Cf. Schiff, in Pauly-Wissowa, *R.-E.*, s. v. Eunostidai 1.

⁶⁶ The text of *I. G.*, II², 1036, line 37 may no longer be considered as evidence for the tribal affiliation of Konthyle. See Hutton, *B. S. A.*, XXI (1914-16), p. 159.

Melainai. From Antiochis.⁶⁷

I. G., II², 2119, line 55.

Oinoe A. From Hippothontis. Coast-deme.

Hesychios, *s. v. Olvai*. *I. G.*, II², 1008, line 105; 1034, frag. *d*, line 5. *Hesperia*, IV (1935), no. 37, line 115. Pritchett-Meritt, *Chronology*, pp. 114-115, lines 13, 18 (= II², 916).

Pentele. From Antiochis.⁶⁸ Inland-deme.

I. G., II², 2097, line 77.

Perrhidai. From Aiantis or Oineis.⁶⁹ Inland-deme.

Harpokration, *s. v. Θυργωνίδαί*. *I. G.*, II², 2362, line 52.

Petalidai.⁷⁰ Inland-deme.

I. G., II², 2050, lines 75-76.

Phlya. From Kekropis. Inland-deme.

Hesychios, *s. v. Φλυείς*. Schol. to Aristophanes, *Vespae*, 234. *I. G.*, II², 1006, line 124; 1008, lines 98, 104, 126, 127; 1009, lines 81-82, 85-86; 1011, lines 101, 106-110; 1028, line 112; 1034, frag. *d*, lines 3, 8; 1036, lines 38, 40-42 (= Hutton, *loc. cit.*); 1043, lines 82, 83, 85; 1714, line 7; 1729, line 2; 1736, line 8; 1755, line 6 (= *Prytaneis*, no. 99); 1945, line 41; 1960, lines 15, 19 (= *Hesperia*, IV [1935], no. 37, lines 113, 117); 1963, line 57; 1996, lines 54-56, 138-139; 2017, line 17; 2018, line 37; 2049, lines 45, 47; 2050, lines 72, 73, 77; 2051, lines 34-36; 2052, lines 55-56; 2067, lines 67-72; 2086, line 79; 2090, lines 93, 94, 100, 103-107; 2097, line 78; 2103, lines 104-109, 112, 114; 2107, lines 23, 25; 2119, lines 52-53; 2128, lines 42-45; 2130, lines 127-128, 130-131; 2207, lines 9, 10, 12; 2223, lines 64-65; 2336, lines 154, 251; 2338, line 36; 2468, line 4. *Insc. Délos*, 2610, lines 13, 26. *Hesperia*, XI (1942), no. 25, lines 18-22, 24-25.

⁶⁷ See Stephanos Byz., *s. v.*, and Kirchner, *ad I. G.*, II², 1602 and 6823. The passage in Stephanos Byz. which assigns Melainai to Antiochis is considered erroneous by Löper (*Ath. Mitt.*, XVII [1892], p. 426, note 1) and Solders (*Die ausserstädtischen Kulte*, p. 115). For the location of this deme in the northwest of Attika, see Milchhöfer (*Untersuchungen*, p. 40) and Toepffer (in Pauly-Wissowa, *R.-E.*, *s. v.* Apaturia).

⁶⁸ So Stephanos Byz. Kirchner (*I. G.*, I², Index, p. 326) does not consider Pentele to have been a deme in the fifth century; see also Milchhöfer, *op. cit.*, p. 40, and Löper, *Ath. Mitt.*, XVII (1892), pp. 424-425. Kirchner is followed by Solders (*Die ausserstädtischen Kulte*, p. 115), who apparently believes, however, that Pentele is to be removed entirely from the list of demes. For bibliography, see Wrede, in Pauly-Wissowa, *R.-E.*, *s. v.* Pentele.

⁶⁹ See above, p. 426, note 50.

⁷⁰ See above, p. 426.

Prospalta. From Akamantis. Inland-deme.

I. G., II², 1008, line 100; 1011, line 112; 1043, line 84; 1960, lines 20, 22 (= *Hesperia*, IV [1935], no. 37, lines 118, 120); 2103, line 110; 2128, line 39. *Prytaneis*, no. 49, line 45.

Semachidai A. From Antiochis. Inland-deme.⁷¹

I. G., II², 2086, line 82; 2193, line 73; 2194, line 14.

Themakos. From Erechtheis. Town-deme.

Stephanos Byz. *I. G.*, II², 1006, line 125; 1008, line 124; 1009, line 87; 1011, line 113.

Thyrgonidai. From Aiantis. Inland-deme.

Harpokration. *I. G.*, II², 2362, line 49.

Titakidai. From Aiantis. Inland-deme.

Harpokration, *s. v.* Θυργωνιδαι. *I. G.*, II², 2050, line 74; 2067, line 63. *Hesperia*, XI (1942), no. 18, line 13.

KENDRICK PRITCHETT.

INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY

AND

COLUMBUS ARMY FLYING SCHOOL

COLUMBUS, MISSISSIPPI.

⁷¹ Solders (*Die ausserstädtischen Kulte*, pp. 41 and 115) has located Semachidai in the Laureotike, thereby making it a coastal deme. This is also the assignment of Gomme (*Population of Athens*, p. 65). The basis for this is to be found in the mining inscription published as *I. G.*, II², 1582, lines 51-54. Kirchner (*ad loc.*), however, following Wilamowitz, had already indicated the inconclusive nature of this reference to Semacheion. Milchhöfer, Löper, Wilamowitz (*Aristoteles und Athen*, II, p. 157), Kirchner (*ad I. G.*, II², 1172, 1582, 1750, and 7377; and *P. A.*, II, p. 609), and Honigmann (in Pauly-Wissowa, *R.-E.*, *s. v.* Semachidai) assign Semachidai to the inland trittys. See also C. D. Buck, *A. J. A.*, V (1889), pp. 162-5—an important topographical study which seems to have been unknown to the German scholars. It may be noted that the inland trittys of Antiochis is now known to have been Pallene; see *Hesperia*, IX (1940), pp. 55-56.

POSSIBLE TROCHAIC DIMETERS IN NON-LATIN ITALIC AND IN GAULISH INSCRIPTIONS.

Careful study of the prayers in the Iguvine Tables, of the Oscan Curse of Vibia, of the scanty Volscian and Paelignian texts, and of the few Gaulish inscriptions which have survived, has led me to believe that portions of them contain trochaic dimeter verse. Metre is, indeed, what one would not unnaturally expect, especially in the prayers and in the Curse, which is really an imprecatory prayer addressed to the divinities of evil. In early times, prayers, like sacrifices, had to be offered with minutest exactness; the slightest deviation, even unintentional, rendered them at best of no effect, and at worst, full of peril; and poetry is notoriously easier to remember than is prose.

So far as non-Latin Italic texts go, the only one, to my knowledge, who has suggested that the Umbrian prayers might be in verse was Rudolf Westphal and he merely called attention to some tetrapodic alliterative lines in them which, he thought, resembled Old Teutonic "long verse" (VIb, 57-60; VIa, 31-33 = lines 103-115, 49-55; *Allgemeine Metrik der indogermanischen und semitischen Völker* [Berlin, 1892], pp. 221-222); for Gaulish, Sir John Rhys suggested metrical occurrences (*Proceedings of the British Academy*, II [1906], p. 281; VI [1910], pp. 283, 285), though I find myself unable to see the same metres as did he.

Metrical texts are very rare in the surviving Iguvine Tables in the native alphabet (only Ib, 18; IIa, 3-4, 25; IIb, 24); and in those in Latin script, several centuries later, the prayers had, in my opinion, suffered much corruption through addition of gloss-words which crept into the text, and through contamination of passages of similar meaning. Consequently, the original metrical form would appear to have been entirely forgotten, even by the priests of Iguvium. In the Curse of Vibia, the metre seems equally obscure as the text stands, complicated by the fact that the name of the man cursed—Pakis Kluvatis Valaimas pukls—is inserted where "N. or M." needs mention, to the harm of the poem (and perhaps of Pacius).

A remarkably close parallel to the state of affairs which I think I find in these documents is furnished by the history of the Avesta text. Much of this—even more than is commonly

supposed—was originally in verse. In the Gāthās, the oldest Avesta documents in written form, metre has been retained for the most part, although the Zoroastrian priests had no idea whatever that they were in anything but prose. Large portions of the so-called “Younger Avesta” (much of which is far older in material than the Gāthās, however later its linguistic form may be) have become so grossly interpolated in course of time that they are still printed as prose in Geldner’s edition; and only patient investigation can reconstruct even a tentative approximation to their original form (cf., e. g., my attempted restorations of Yasna lvii in *J. A. O. S.*, LVIII [1938], pp. 310-323, and of the Haðōxt Nask in the *Jackson Memorial Volume*, to appear in Bombay).

The metre here under consideration is trochaic dimeter throughout, except for the Umbrian VIb, 60 = lines 111-114, and the Oscan V = lines 17-19; the presence or absence of elision of final vowels and diphthongs seems capricious; final *-es* seems to suffer echthipsis in VIb, 62 = VIIb, 13, 14 = lines 122, 134, 142; and there are inconsistencies of epenthetic and syncopated vowels, though scarcely more so than in Early Latin verse. The Curse appears to fall into three-lined strophes, in which the interpolated name of the person execrated makes a spurious and unmetrical fourth; in the Volscian and Paelignian inscriptions, we may have strophes of five lines; in the Umbrian, I cannot yet find any definite strophic arrangement.

In the text of the Curse, I have followed, almost without exception, the admirable restoration by R. G. Kent (*Class. Phil.*, XX [1925], pp. 243-267; text, p. 256); and omitted text-words are indicated by square brackets, added words by parentheses, and the metrical thesis by the acute accent; but it has not seemed necessary here to distinguish typographically between documents in native and in Latin alphabets.

If the theory here advanced be deemed to possess merit, its implications have value far outside non-Latin Italic. The trochaic dimeter was evidently an Italo-Celtic metre; it may even have been that of the “great number of verses” in which the Druids transmitted their oral teachings (Caesar, *B. G.*, VI, 14, 3); and it reappears in Christian hymnody, as in the three-lined strophes of the twelfth-century sequence of the *Dies irae*; or even in a few Latin fragments, e. g., the lines ascribed to Hadrian

(*Fragmenta poetarum Latinorum*, ed. E. Baehrens [Leipzig, 1886], p. 373) :

ego nolo Florus esse,
ambulare per tabernas,
latitare per popinas,
culices pati rotundos.

A. UMBRIAN—IGUVINE TABLES

- IIa, 3-4: (3) pére kárne [speturie Atiieŕie] áviekáte
(4) áúú urtú fefúre,
fétu púze néip erétu.¹
- IIa, 25: tíu púni, tíu vínu.
- [5] IIb, 24: Íupáter Sáçe, téfe
éstu vítlu vúfru séstu.
- VIa, 4-5: ² (4) párfá dérŕua, c[u]rnáco dérŕua,
péico mérsto, péica mérsta,
mérsta áueif, mérstaf (5) ánglaf [esona]
[10] méhe, tóte Íioúéine,
ésmei stáhmei stáhmeitéi.³
- VIa, 22-34: ⁴ (22) téio súbocáu subóco,
(23) Déi Grabóuī, ocríper Fíſiu,
t[o]táper Íioúína, érer
[15] nómnepér, erár nomnéper;
fós [sei], pacér sei ócre Físei,
(24) tót[e] Íioúíne, érer
nómne(pér), erár nomné(per),
[Arsie,] tío súbocáu subóco; ⁵
[20] Déi Grabóue, ársier fríte
tío súbocáu (25) subóco,
Déi Grabóue, Dí Grabóue,

¹ Cf. VIa, 27 = line 31.

² = VIa, 2-3, 17-18, except for *tefe* instead of *mehe* in the latter passage.

³ For the metrical diphthongisation cf. Old Latin *Romañ*.

⁴ VIa, 23-25 are identical with VIb, 6-8, except for the substitution of *F[i]sóuī Sánsi* for *Déi Grabóuī*; VIa, 25-34 with VIb, 26-27, except for the similar substitution of *Téfro Íóuī*; and VIa, 25-34 with VIa, 35-44, 45-54, except for the unmetrical addition of *atru* in lines 35, 38, 43, and of *tertiu* in lines 45, 48, 53.

⁵ For the quantity of *sobóco* cf. that of Latin *vōci*, Sanskrit *vāka*.

- [tio esu] búe p[e]rácr[ei pihaclu] * ocréper
 Físiu,
 t[o]táper Íouína, írer
 [25] nómnepér, (26) erár nomnéper
 (tío súbocáu subóco).⁷
 Déi Grabóuie, órer óse,
 pérsei ócre Físié pír [orto] est,
 (pérsei) tóte Íouíne⁸
 [30] ársmor dérsecór (27) subátor [sent],
 (fétu) púsei néip herítu.⁹
 [Dei Grabouie,] pérsei túer perscler uás-
 [e]t[o] est,
 pés[e]t[om] est, pér[e]t[om] est, (28)
 frós[e]t[om] est, dá[e]t[om] est,
 [tuer] perscler uírs[e]t[o] auírs[e]to uás
 est,
 [35] Dí Grabóuie, pérsei mérsei,
 [esu] búe (29) [peracrei] píhacnú piháfei.
 Dí [Grabouie,] pihátu ócre Físei,
 pího¹⁰ tóta Íouína.
 Dí [Grabouie,] pihátu ócrer (30) Físier,
 [40] (pího) tótar Íouínar
 nóme, nér(e)f, ársmo, uéiro,
 péquo, cástruo, frí pihátu;
 fútu fós pacér pasé tua
 ócre Físi, (31) tót[e] Íiouíne,
 [45] érer nóme, érar nóme.
 Dí Grabóuie, sáluo s[e]rítu
 ócre Físi, [salua seritu] tót[a] Íiouína.
 Dí (32) Grabóuie, sáluo s[e]rítu
 ócrer Físier, tót[ar] Íiouínar
 [50] nóme, nér(e)f, ársmo, uéiro,
 péquo, cástruo, frí [salua] (33) serítu;
 fútu fós, pacér pasé tua

* Cf. also VIb, 28: [tiom esu] sórsu persiontrú [Tefrali pihaclu] ocríper; VIb, 31: [esu] sórsu persiondrú [pihaclu] piháfi.

⁷ For the added line cf. VIa, 34 = line 59.

⁸ Text: *toteme Iouine*, but *tote Iiouine* in VIb, 29.

⁹ Cf. line 3.

¹⁰ Text: *pihatu*; the verb is omitted in the parallel passage VIb, 31.

- [55] ócre Físi, tót[e] Iouíne,
éerer nómnne, éerar nómnne.
Dí Grabóuie, tíó ésu
búe (34) p[e]rácr[ei pihaclu] ocréper
Físiu,
t[o]táper Iouína, éerer
nómnepér, erár nomnéper,
[Di Grabouie,] tíó súbocáu (subóco).
- [60] VIa, 54-55: (54) [Di Grabouie,] tíó cómo[ho]tá tribís[i]ne
búo p[e]rácr[o pihaclo] (55) ocríper
Físiu,
t[o]táper Iouína, éerer
nómnepér, erár nomnéper,
[Di Grabouie,] tíom súbocáu (subóco).
- [65] VIb, 9-15: (9) F[i]sóuie Sánšie, [tiom esa] méfa spéfa
Fisouín[a] ocríper Físiu,
t[o]táper Iouína, (10) éerer
nómnepér, erár nomnéper.
F[i]sóuie Sánšie, dítu ócre
[70] Físi, tóte Iouíne,
(dítu) ócrer Físie, tótar
Iouínar dú(o)púrsus
(11) péturpúrsus fáto fíto
pérne póstne, sépse s[a]rsíte,
[75] uóuse áuie esóne;
fútu fóns, pacér pasé tua
ócre Físi, tót[e] Iouíne,
(12) éerer nómnne, éerar nómnne.
F[i]sóuie Sánšie, sáluo s[e]rítu
[80] ócrem Físi, tót[am] Iouínam.
F[i]sóuie Sánšie, sáluo s[e]rítu
(13) ócrer Físier, tót[ar] Iouínar
nóme, nér(e)f, ársmo, uíro,
péquo, cástruo, fríf [salua] serítu;
[85] fútu fóns, pacér pasé (14) tua
ócre Físi, tót[e] Iouíne,
éerer nómnne, éerar nómnne.
F[i]sóuie Sánšie, [tiom esa] méfa spéfa
Fisouín[a] ocríper Físiu,

- [90] (15) t[o]táper f̃iouxína, érer
nómnepér, erár nomnéper.
[Fisouie Sanšie,] tíom súbocáu (subóco)
[Fisouie frite tiom subocau].¹¹
- [95] VIb, 53-55: (53) písest tótar (54) Társináter,
[trifor Tarsinater,] Túscer, Náharcér,
Iabúscer
nómnner, é[e]tu é[he]su póplu.
nósue ier [ehe] ésu póplu,
sópír hábe (55) ésme póple,
p[o]rtátu úlo púe mérsest,
[100] fétu úru pírise mérs est.
- VIb, 57-62: (57) Sérfe Mártje, Pr[e]stóta Šérfja [Šerfer
(58) Martier],
Túrsa Šérfja Šérfer Mártjer,¹²
tótam [Tarsinatem], trífo Társinátem,
Túscom, Náharcóm, Iabúscom [nome],
[105] (59) tótar [Tarsinater], trífor Társináter,
Túscer, Náharcér, Iabúscer [nomner]
nérf šihítu ánsihítu,
ioux̃[e] hostátu (60) ánhostátu
tursítu, tremítu,
[110] hóndu, hólту,
nínctu, nepítu,
sonítu, saúitu,
préplotátu, préulátu.
- (61) Sérfe Mártje, Pr[e]stóta Šérfja [Šerfer
Martier],
[115] Túrsa Šérfja Šérfer Mártjer,
f[u]túto fónér pácrer páse [uestra]
póple tótar f̃iouxínar,
(62) tóte f̃iouxíne, éro
nér[u]s sihítir ánsihítir,

¹¹ Cf. lines 59, 64; for the omission of the following line cf. the parallel passages VIa, 34, 55; VIb, 36.

¹² Cf. VIIa, 47-51, except, instead of the divinities here mentioned, only *Túrsa Ioux̃ia* [Šerfer Martier]; Tursa Iouia is mentioned in VIIa, 47, 49, 53 = Ib, 43; Tursa Šerfia in VIb, 58, 61; VIIa, 41 = Ib, 31; Honds Iouins in IIa, 20, 34; and Honds Šerfir in Ib, 4; VIb, 45.

- [120] *íouī[es]* ¹³ *hostátir ánostátir,*
 éro nómne, érar nómne.
- VIIa, 9-20: ¹⁴ (9) *Pr[e]stóta (10) Šérġia Šérfer Mártġier,*
 tíom ésir ŷésclir ádrir
 póplupér tot[ar] ġiouġinar,
 [125] *tótapér ġiouġina, érer*
 nómnepér, (11) erár nomnéper
 (tíom subocáu subóco).
 Pr[e]stóta Šérġia Šérfer Mártġier,
 pr[e]ŷéndu ŷia écla át[e]ro
 [130] *tóte [Tarsinate], trifo Társináte,*
 (12) *Túrsce, Náharcé, ġabúsce [nomne],*
 tótar [Tarsinater], trífor Társináter,
 Túscer, Náharcér, ġabúscer [nomner]
 (13) *nér[u]s š(ih)ítir ánsihítir,*
 [135] *íouī[es]* ¹⁵ *hostátir ánostátir,*
 éro nómne, (érar nómne).
 Pr[e]stóta Šérġia Šérfer Mártġier,
 fútu fóns (14) pacér pasé tŷa
 póple tótar ġiouġinar, [tote Iiouine,]
 [140] *érom nómne, érar nómne,*
 [erar] nér[u]s šihítir ánsihítir,
 íouī[es] ¹⁶ (15) *hostátir ánostátir.*
 Pr[e]stóta Šérġia [Šerfer Martier], sáluom
 s[e]rítuu
 póplom tótar ġiouġinar,
 [145] *sálu s[e]rítuu (16) tót[am] ġiouġinam.*
 Pr[e]stóta Šérġia [Serfer Martier], sáluo
 s[e]rítu
 pópler tótar ġiouġinar [totar Iiouinar]
 (17) *nóme, nér(e)f, ársmo, ŷíro,*
 péquo, cástruo, frif [salua] serítu;
 [150] *fútu fóns pacér pasé tŷa*
 póple tótar ġiouġinar, (18) [tote Iiouine,]

¹³ Cf. the echthipsis of final *s* before vowels in Early Latin, and the form *íouī[e]* in line 108 and VIIa, 48.

¹⁴ Cf. VIIa, 21-23, 25-34, except for *álfir* in VIIa, 26, 32, 34, instead of *ádrir*; the unmetrical *ahauendu* in VIIa, 27, instead of *pr[e]ŷéndu*; in VIIa, 21, 35, *tiom plener* is added after *ádrir* and *alfer* respectively.

¹⁵ See note 13 *supra*.

¹⁶ See note 13 *supra*.

- éer er nó mne, éer ar nó mne.
 Pr[e]stóta Šér fja Šér fer Mártj er,
 tíom ésir uésclir ádrer
 [155] póplupér (19) tot[ar] fja uínar,
 tótapér fja uína, éer er
 nó mnepér, éer ar nomnéper.
 Pr[e]stóta Šér fja Šér fer Mártj er,
 tíom (20) sú bocáuu (subóco);
 [160] Pr[e]stótar Šér fjar Šér fer Mártj er,
 [foner] fríte [tíom] sú bocáuu (subóco).

B. OSCAN—CURSE OF VIBIA ¹⁷

- I Kér[i] Arént(ikái man)áfum,
 pái (pai) púi (p)ui hériam súvam,
 légín(úm suvám afl)ákad,
 [(Pakim Kluvatiium Valaimas puklum,
 inim)] ¹⁸
 [5] úsurs ínim málaks nístrus
 [Pakiu(i) Kluvatiui Vala(i)mas p(uklui)],
 II ántkadúm damía(i mállai) ¹⁹
 (pái pui súvam hériam súvam), ²⁰
 légín[um] áflukád, idík tfei
 [10] [manafum Vibii ai Prebai] ²¹
 III ámpu[(l)u]lúm da(dá)d (manáfum);
 Kér[i] Ar[éntikái] (manáfum)
 [(Pakim Kluvatiium) Valaimas puklum],
 ínim úlas légínéi. svai
 [15] IV néip dadíd, lamátir ákrid
 éiseis dúnte(is kúru ps súlum,
 ínim dumátir) ²²
 V ínim kaispátar
 i(ním) krustátar.

¹⁷ Restorations by Buck and Kent, the latter being noted in each instance; italicised restorations are proposed by the present writer.

¹⁸ So Kent.

¹⁹ Kent: *damia* (*d pesemad*).

²⁰ So Kent.

²¹ Kent: *Vibii ai Prebai am pu(k)ulum*; the *ampu(l)ulum* of Buck's text seems to be a dittography.

²² So Kent.

- [20] svái neip, ávt sv[ai tiium] idík fifíkus
[pust eis(uk)],
VI (pún kahád svemnúm [avt] diírnum),²³
pún kahád [avt] (svemnúm) n(uhtí)rnum,²⁴
- [25] néip putiíád (*pidúm*) pun[um] káhad;
VII ávt svai píđ perfá(kiūm káhad,
púst eisúk (*per*)fákiūm neip)²⁵
pútiíad; níp hu(n)truís nip súpruís
- VIII áisusís putiíáns píđum(*pid*),
(*pid*) putiíáns uftéis udf(ákium
[nistrus²⁶ Pakiui Kluvatiui) Valaimas
puklui].
- [30] pún far ká[ha]d, nip pútiíad édum,
IX níp menvúm limú(m) píđ(úm (*pid*)
pútiíad súlum éisunk páflum)²⁷
- X pái humúns bivús karánter.
súluh (*súluh*) [Pakis Kluvatiis Valaim(a)s
puk(ls)] túr[u]mííad l(úvfrum;
- [35] idík éstud ínim prúfum)²⁸ [Vibíiai Ak-
viiai].
- XI (*sákr[im] iónk*) svai púh aflákus
[Pakim Kluvatiium Valaimas puklum²⁹],
súpr(us téras, *súprus ápas*)³⁰
ínim túvai légin[ei] ínim
- [40] sákr[im] (*iónk*) svai púh aflákus
XII húntrus téras, húntrus á(pas³¹
[Pakim Kluvatiium) Valaima[i]s puk-
lu(m)]
(*ínim túvai léginéi*) avt
- [45] Kér[i] Arét[ikái] avt úlas
XIII léginéi (nuhtírnas)³² trútas,

²³ So Kent.²⁴ So Kent.²⁵ So Kent.²⁶ So Kent.²⁷ So Kent.²⁸ So Kent.²⁹ Text: *puklui*.³⁰ Kent: *suprus teras tuvai heriai sakrim*.³¹ So Kent.³² So Kent.

tús(z fuid [Pakis Kluvatiis Valaimas
puk(ls)] *ídik tféi manáfum*).³³

Buck, 20, 6, 8, 9: nép fatiúm nep déikum pútians;
nep deikum nep fátium pútíad;
nep memním nep úlam [sifei] hériiad.

C. VOLSCIAN (Conway 252 = von Planta 240)

sépis átahús [pis] Ůélestrom,
[faeia] ésarístrom, sé bim ásif,
uésclis, uínu árpatítu.
sépis tótícú couéhriū
sépu, férom píhom éstu.

[5]

D. PAELIGNIAN (Conway 216 = von Planta 254)

úsur príst[a]falác[i]rix prísmu
pétiedú ip uíðad uíððu
ómnit[u] Ůranías éuc
émp(e)rátóis clíuist, cérfum
sácarácirix semúnu,
sú[a] aetátu f[i]ráta fértlid
praícimé Persépon[as] áfðed.
eíte [uus] prítromé pacrís puus
écic léxe lífar; dída
déti uús³⁴ hanúst[u] Heréntas.

[5]

[10]

E. GAULISH.

Dottin, no. 7: Σέγομάρος Ούιλλόνεος
τ[ο]ούτιους νάμανσάτις ειώρον
Βήλησ[α]μί σοσίν νεμήτον.

Dottin, nos. 20, 32: δέδε βράτονδέ καντένα.

[5] Dottin, no. 33:³⁵ Mártiális Dánnotáli
iéuru Ůcuétin sósín
célicnón etíc gobédbi
dúgijíontjio Ůcuétin
ín Alísija.

³³ Kent: *tusz fuid pakis kluvatiis valaimas puk*.

³⁴ Text: *uus deti*.

³⁵ Cf. J. Rhys, *Proceedings of the British Academy*, II (1906), p. 281.

- [10] Dottin, no. 37: Doíros Ségomári iéuru
 Álisánu.
- Dottin, no. 38: ³⁶ Íccavós Oppíanícnos
 iéuru Brígindóni cánt[a]lon.
- Dottin, no. 39: ³⁷ Lícnos Cóntextós ieúru
 Ánval[o]nnácu cán[e]cosédlon.

LOUIS H. GRAY.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

³⁶ Cf. Rhys, *op. cit.*, VI (1910), p. 283; my pupil, Mr. Robert Fowkes, suggests for the second line the equally possible reading *iéuru Bríndóni cantálon* (for the loss of intervocalic *g* in Gaulish, see his study of Gaulish phonology in comparison with Indo-European in *Language*, XVI [1940], pp. 285-299). The same phenomenon seems to be present in the Umbrian forms *fiouína*, *louína*, *I(i)ouína* side by side, as compared with *Ikuvína*, *Iiuvína* in the native alphabet (cf. Buck, § 148).

³⁷ Cf. Rhys, *op. cit.*, VI, p. 285.

THE SOVEREIGNTY OF ERIN.

More than ten years ago we had an occasion to discuss the curious concept of the Sovereignty or Kingship of Ireland embodied in the form of a beautiful woman, and we drew attention to similar concepts known to have existed among other branches of the Indo-European family of peoples. On the strength of these data we inferred, tentatively, that this concept is very ancient and appears to antedate the separation of the *centum* from the *satem* branch of the great linguistic family.¹ In reviewing our book, M. J. Vendryes frankly admitted this possibility but added that our assertion would require additional proof.²

What prevented us, at the time, from a more thorough study of the problem was obviously the impossibility of including in a handbook, covering universal mythology in 450 pages, a dissertation devoted to a problem of this nature, however interesting in itself. Thus it may not be amiss to re-open the question and to inquire into the age, meaning, and probable origin of one of the most fascinating legends of Ancient Ireland.

The Book of Ballymote, an Irish MS dating from the end of the fourteenth century, contains the *Cóir Anmann*, a treatise on the origin of the nicknames of ancient Irish kings and heroes, which, among others, relates the following story.³

Daire has five sons all named Lugaid, of one of whom it had been foretold that he would be king of Ireland. Wishing to obtain more definite information, Daire consults a druid at the assembly of Teltown, where his sons have gone to race their horses; he is told that the one who will take the fawn with the golden sheen will succeed him to the kingship.

¹ *Mythologie Universelle* (Paris, Payot, 1930), p. 115.

² *Revue Celtique*, XLVIII (1931), p. 415.

³ Ed. tr. W. Stokes, in W. Stokes u. E. Windisch, *Irische Texte*, III (2) (Leipzig, 1897), pp. 317-23, § 70; cf. Geoffrey Keating, *History of Ireland*, I, § 27; Dinneen's translation, II, pp. 149-51. Cf. further W. Stokes, *Academy*, XLI (1892), p. 399; A. Nutt, *ibid.*, p. 425; G. H. Maynadier, *The Wife of Bath's Tale* (London, 1901), pp. 25 ff.; J. Weston, *Folk-Lore*, XII (1901), p. 373; Gaston Paris, *Histoire Littéraire*, XXX (1888), p. 102; W. H. Schofield, *English Literature from the Norman Conquest to Chaucer* (New York, 1906), pp. 224 ff.; John R. Reinhard, *The Survival of Geis in Mediaeval Romance* (Halle, 1933), pp. 349 ff.

When the fawn comes, Daire's sons with the men of Erin pursue it until a magical mist separates them from their followers. In the end Lugaid Laigde catches and kills the fawn. Then a great snow falls, and one of the sons goes to seek shelter. He finds a house with a huge fire, food and ale in abundance, silver dishes, couches of white bronze, and a horrible hag. She offers the boy a bed if he will lie with her that night. Upon his refusal she declares that he has thus severed from himself "sovranty" and the kingship. The other sons, except Lugaid Laigde, go in succession to beg for shelter; but none is asked to spend the night. At last Lugaid Laigde goes with her into the house for food and ale. As she goes into the couch he follows her and sees, to his astonishment, that her face is radiant like the rising sun in the month of May, and her fragrance is like an odorous herb-garden. Lugaid embraces her and is told: "Good is thy journey, for I am the Sovranty, and thou shalt obtain the sovranty of Erin."

A metrical version of the same story is found in the *Dindshenchas of Carn Máil*, in the Book of Leinster, a MS of the middle of the twelfth century: ⁴

Daire, a king of Ulster in S. Patrick's time, had seven sons, all named Lugaidh. He had also a magical fawn, which was hunted down and slain one day by four of the sons. The latter, apparently separated from their retainers, arrive at a house where they are to pass the night. As they are sitting around the fire, an old hag enters, foul and loathsome to look upon. She threatens to transform them all, dogs and men, if one of the brothers will not lie with her. Lugaidh Laigde offers to sacrifice himself for the rest. Then, as the fire grows dark, the foul hag is changed into a beautiful woman who reveals herself as the Sovereignty of Ireland and Scotland. But Lugaidh Laigde is not to lie with her after all, that honor being reserved for his son, who will one day be a great king.

There is no need to rehearse here the common features of the two texts; they are sufficiently numerous to warrant the inference

⁴ E. Gwynn, *The Metrical Dindshenchas*, IV (Dublin, 1924), pp. 135 ff. Cf. also Kuno Meyer, *Zeitschrift f. Celtische Philologie*, III (1901), p. 460, § 8; *Academy*, XLI, p. 399; Maynadier, *op. cit.*, pp. 29 ff.; 195; Reinhard, *op. cit.*, pp. 352 f. In view of the resemblance of the description of the hag to an analogous portrait of a loathly female in Cúan O'Lócháin's *Echtra mac Echdach Mugmedóin* the inference would seem justified that the story is much older than its MS form: O'Lócháin died in 1024.

that both are variants ultimately derived from a common original. This unknown text must have contained the two central motives found in both versions, viz. (1) the story of the fawn with the golden sheen and (2) the story of the hag.

Now it might be (and indeed has been ⁵) conjectured that the former is a secondary theme, devised for the simple purpose of bringing about the separation of the princes from their followers and to put them in touch with the fairy (for such the hag evidently is), according to a wide-spread *märchen* formula.⁶ But this conclusion is inadmissible, for the text of the Book of Ballymote expressly states that the sovereignty is destined to him who will hunt down the mysterious fawn, while in the metrical version the fawn is already in the possession of the heroes' father, who is king. If a hunt for it is arranged, it is evidently with a view to determining which of the seven princes is to be the old king's successor. In any case, it is evident that the two themes represent merely a doubling of the same idea; they are parallels. The sovereignty, i. e. the kingship, of Ireland is personified (1) by the fawn with the golden sheen and (2) by the hag subsequently transformed into a beautiful woman. The fact that the hero who slays the fawn is also the one who complies with the hag's request, thereby winning the kingship, merely confirms this conclusion.⁷

We now propose to examine the two motives, to determine, if possible, whether they are typically Irish and Celtic, or whether they are found elsewhere, either as universal folk-lore motives or, perhaps, as an appanage of the peoples of Indo-European speech.

I

In the lost Greek epic known under the name of *Alcmaeonis* we meet with the tradition of the two hostile brothers Atreus and Thyestes, the sons of Pelops. Their hatred for one another is produced, according to the ancient legend, by a lamb with a golden fleece, a present given them by the god Hermes intent

⁵ Nutt, *loc. cit.*

⁶ W. Hertz, *Spielmannsbuch* (Stuttgart, 1900), p. 354; C. Pschmidt, *Die Sage von der verfolgten Hinde* (diss. Greifswald, 1911); Bolte-Polivka, *Märchen-Anmerkungen*, II, pp. 345 ff.; Thompson, *Motif-Index*, N 774.

⁷ Cf. also Maynadier, p. 27; Reinhard, p. 351.

on avenging on the sons of Pelops the death of his own son Myrtilus, treacherously slain by Pelops. The real import of this mysterious lamb is brought out by the Greek tragedians and by Seneca, who are agreed that the lamb confers upon Atreus, as *regni stabilimen sui*, the dominion over the inherited kingdom. Thyestes seduces his sister-in-law and obtains the lamb through her treachery; but a miracle frustrates his hope of seizing his brother's throne at the same time, and he has to go into exile.⁸

It is unnecessary to summarize here the various interpretations of the story proposed by the ancients; they merely prove that the real import and true meaning of the lamb was no longer understood in late classical times. In recent years Professor A. B. Cook⁹ conjectured that the lamb was the theriomorphic manifestation of Zeus himself. It should be noted, however, that the Greek tragedians and Seneca (who drew on them) appear to have had no doubt about the essential fact that the lamb (in Seneca it is a ram) was meant to be a symbol of the kingship, while an *Iliad* commentary, which also utilized ancient sources, intimates that the kingship of Mycene was attached to the possession of the lamb.¹⁰ Whoever has the lamb is king, and if Thyestes tries to obtain possession of the lamb he is evidently guided by the afterthought that he will thereby also obtain possession of his brother's kingdom. The lamb in this ancient Hellenic tradition is thus seen to play much the same rôle as the fawn with the golden sheen in the Irish tale.

A second parallel hails from Persia. There the compilation known under the title of *History of Artachšir i Pâpakân*,¹¹ composed toward the beginning of the seventh century of our era, relates the flight of Artachšir, the founder of the dynasty of the Sassanids, from Ardewân, the lawful ruler of Persia, with the latter's daughter. No sooner does Ardewân become aware of this flight than he sets out in pursuit of the fugitives. On the road he asks the peasants he encounters whether they have noticed the

⁸ Cf. Roscher's *Ausführliches Lexikon*, I, pp. 712 ff.; Pauly-Wissowa, *R.-E.*, II, cols. 2140 f.; A. B. Cook, *Zeus*, I (Cambridge, 1914), pp. 405 ff.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 407.

¹⁰ Schol. *Il.*, II, 106; cf. schol. Euripides, *Or.*, 812; cf. Cook, pp. 405 ff.

¹¹ Th. Nöldeke, in Bezzenberger's *Beiträge*, IV (1879), pp. 44 f.; for a parallel version cf. Firdousi, *Le Livre des Rois*, trad. J. Mohl (Paris, 1876-78), V, pp. 230 ff.

fleeing couple, and he is told: "This morning at sunrise they passed as fast as the wind, followed by a fat ram, than which there can exist no better." Ardewân's dastûr, who accompanies his master, interprets this ram as the "majesty of dominion" which follows Artachšir. Ardewân obtains the same information about the fugitives on stopping at a second place. Finally he meets a caravan and is told: "Between you and the fleeing couple there is still a distance of twenty parasangs. We have noticed that a very large and powerful ram was sitting on the crupper behind the couple." Then Ardewân realizes that the "majesty of dominion" has now attained Artachšir and that it is past all possibility of overtaking him. Thus, discouraged, the king gives up the pursuit and returns home. But Artachšir soon collects an army, marches against his former master and dethrones him.

No one will seriously maintain that the occurrence of the ram, lamb, or fawn as symbols of kingship in Iran, in pre-historic Greece, and in mediaeval Ireland is due to literary borrowings. In all three cases we are rather dealing with very ancient legendary material shared by at least three branches of the Indo-European family.

II

We now proceed to a discussion of the second of the two motives pointed out in the Irish stories, the personification of the kingship in the form of a beautiful young girl. Here it is worth noting, first, that even in Ireland it is not necessarily connected with the motive just discussed. Thus a second text of the Book of Ballymote presents the following reading:¹²

Eochaid, king of Ireland, had four sons by his wife and one, Niall, by a captive Saxon princess. One day, as the five brothers were hunting, they strayed away from their followers. Tired and thirsty they looked for a spring. When at last they found one, they beheld a frightful hag guarding it. Fergus, one of the elder sons, demanded a drink. He might have it, the hag replied, if he would kiss her. "Not so," he answered haughtily.—"Then the water shall not be granted by me." Two others of the elder sons had no better luck. The fourth, having learned from his brothers'

¹² S. H. O'Grady, *Silva Gadelica* (London, 1892), I, pp. 326-30; II, pp. xxiv, 368-73; cf. also Maud Joynt, in *Eriu*, IV (1908), pp. 104 f.; Maynardier, pp. 27 ff.; W. Stokes, *Revue Celtique*, XXIV (1903), pp. 190-207; Reinhard, pp. 353 ff.

experience, kissed her, but it was the barest brush of a kiss, whereupon the hag said: "Have thou but mere contact of Tara!" And this came true, for of this prince's seed two did rule Ireland, but of the other brothers' not one. Last of all Niall went for water and consented to kiss and hug the hag. As he did so, the latter was changed into a young woman of extreme comeliness. "Who art thou?" he asked full of astonishment.—"Royal rule am I," was the answer; "Thine and thy children's shall be for ever the kingdom and the supreme power. And as at first thou hast seen me ugly, brutish, loathly but in the end beautiful, even so is royal rule. Without fierce conflict it may not be won; but in the end, he that is king shows comely and nobly forth." Niall became a famous king of Ireland, generally known as Niall of the Nine Hostages.

Another Irish version, entitled *Baile in Scáil* ("Champion's Ecstasy"¹³) has been preserved in the MS Harley 5280, of the sixteenth century, and Rawlinson B 512, of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, though the story itself is much older, being mentioned by Flann Mainistrech, who died in 1056. It reads as follows:

The high-king Conn Cetchathach beholds a horseman approaching him in a dense mist, who invites the monarch to his palace, the splendor of which is described, and gives his name as Lug mac Ethlenn. In the palace Conn sees a maiden bearing a golden diadem and having beside her a vat of ale. She is none other than the Sovereignty of Ireland. Lug then reveals to Conn the length of his reign and names every king who shall rule in Tara after him. Then the maiden asks to whom the ale is to be given, and Lug instructs her to give it to Conn. He then pronounces a short prophecy in verse bearing on Conn's reign. The maiden repeats her question, and Lug replies that the ale is to be given to Art, son of Conn. Of him, too, Lug prophesies, and the process is repeated for each succeeding high-king.

Here again the Irish concept of a personification of the kingdom has a close parallel in ancient Iran. In his account of the

¹³ E. O'Curry, *Lectures on the Manuscript Materials of Ancient Irish History* (Dublin, 1878), pp. 388 f.; 618-22; H. D'Arbois de Jubainville, *Le Cycle mythologique irlandais et la mythologie celtique* (Paris, 1884), pp. 301 ff.; J. Loth, *Revue archéologique*, IV^e série, XXIV (1914), p. 222; Reinhard, pp. 356 f. On a related Welsh version in the Red Book of Hergest cf. H. N. and N. K. Chadwick, *The Growth of Literature*, I (Cambridge, 1932), p. 455.

great revolt of Bahrâm-Tschubîn against Hormuzd IV, son of Kosrau I Anûshirwân (579-590), the chronicler Tabarî tells the following story: ¹⁴

Hunting one day a wild ass, Bahrâm and his retinue enter a vast park inside of which they behold a beautiful château. Bahrâm enters the latter alone, bidding his followers wait for him outside, and promptly sends food and refreshments out, which they greatly enjoy. As he is long in rejoining them, one of them ventures inside the château and finds his master in conversation with a girl of superhuman beauty. Bahrâm sends him out again, promising to be with them in a short time, and after a while they see him come out, accompanied by the girl as far as the gate. On the following day two of his companions hastily depart for the king's court, to report to Hormuzd what they have seen. The king then calls his chief mobed to consult him on the matter. The mobed replies: "That young girl is a peri who accompanies him in all his battles and assures him of victory."

While this account does not expressly state that the fair girl is the Sovereignty of Iran but represents her rather as a personification of Bahrâm's fortune, the sequel of the story leaves no doubt about her true identity. For Bahrâm soon breaks out in open revolt against his royal master and after the latter's death drives the heir presumptive from the land. Then he seats himself on a golden throne, places the crown of the Sassanids on his own head, and exercises all the functions of a king.

Nor is a similar concept absent from India. There the great goddess Lakshmî, the Hindoo Fortuna, is looked upon more especially as the *Fortuna Regis*, the protecting deity of every king, while many texts declare outright that she is the king's wife.¹⁵

Here the objection might be raised that in some of the Irish texts Lady Royalty (as she may properly be called) appears in two completely different shapes, first as an old hag of repulsive exterior, then as a young woman of rare beauty. These versions involve a test: only he who is willing to caress the hag is evidently deemed worthy of enjoying the kingship. We have seen above that the unknown author of the second text of the Book of Bally-

¹⁴ Trad. H. Zotenberg (Paris, 1867-74), II, pp. 267 f.; for a parallel account cf. Firdousi, trad. Mohl, VI, pp. 533 ff.

¹⁵ Cf. Friedrich S. Krauss, *Sreča. Glück und Schicksal im Volksglauben der Südslaven* (Wien, 1886), p. 6.

mote ventured to explain the allegory. His interpretation is logical enough, although susceptible of greater generalization, e. g., that only he who is not afraid of its more unpleasant duties, the seamy side of kingship, is truly worthy of enjoying its blessings. But it may well be doubted whether such a fine-spun allegory was really in the minds of the first narrators. The true meaning is probably more simple, and here again Persian traditions furnish the clue. Speaking of the Iranian kings, the chronicler Al-Tha'âlibî expresses himself as follows: "[Zaw] had received the sovereignty from Afrâsiyâb when it was like an ugly toothless old woman; he transmitted it to Kaïqobâdh like a young bride."¹⁶ In this text the ugly old woman is the kingship of an old and unpopular ruler—the tyrant Afrâsiyâb is stated to have reigned nearly 400 years—while the lovely young bride is the rule of a young king, on whom his subjects set high hopes, and one cannot help recalling that even now the first years of a new reign or a new administration are popularly likened to a honeymoon. In other words, the old hag represents the old reign, the beautiful young woman the new reign, initiated by a young ruler or a new dynasty.

This conclusion is borne out by other facts. A reign or administration is of course a more or less narrowly circumscribed period of time, comparable to one or the other of the natural divisions of time, e. g. the calendar year. Now it is a well-known fact that in many annually recurring rites, usually held in spring, the old year is represented by an old woman, who is ceremoniously driven out of the community, burned, drowned, fustigated, sawed asunder, etc., while just as often the new year is represented by a young girl, the May Queen.¹⁷ On the same reasoning, it would appear, an old and worn-out reign could be symbolized by an ugly old hag who, at the death of the old ruler and the accession of a young one, might be thought to transform herself into a beautiful young woman. At all events, such an explanation will, we believe, do better justice to the texts than another one, proposed some thirty years ago, which saw in the hag a symbol of the

¹⁶ *Histoire des Rois des Perses* par Aboû Mansoûr 'Abd al-Malik ibn Mohammed ibn Isma'il Al-Tha'âlibî, éd. et trad. par Hermann Zotenberg (Paris, 1900), p. 137.

¹⁷ Cf. H. Usener, *Kleine Schriften*, IV (1914), pp. 93-143, especially pp. 199 ff.; Sir James G. Frazer, *The Dying God* (London, 1935), pp. 240 ff.

Night, in the hero, the Prince of Day, at whose contact Night is transformed into the fair Aurora or Dawn.¹⁸ One fails to see how this explanation, which harks back to the mythological fancies of Max Müller and his school, can account for the clearly expressed connection of the theme with royal rule. Let us conclude this disquisition by pointing out that the likening of the supreme power to a fair woman appears to have been a commonplace with the rhetors of Hellenism; for Dio Chrysostomus in one place speaks of "blessed Lady Royalty, child of King Zeus."¹⁹

III

It may be readily granted that with Dio Chrysostomus and with the authors of some of the mediaeval Irish texts the young woman of supernatural beauty was a fair and quite apt allegory of royal rule. The Persian texts relating the vision of Bahrâm make it clear, however, that to the Iranian chroniclers, composing these stories toward the end of the Sassanid period, that glorious woman in a fairy palace was far more than an allegory; for she evidently personified what in everyday parlance we should now call Bahrâm's "star," while to speak of the Hindoo Lakshmî, of Atreus' lamb, of Artachšir's ram, or of the Irish fawn with the golden sheen as "allegories" would be to profess obvious absurdities. Allegory is a product of late, one is tempted to say decadent, periods and a purely literary phenomenon. At best it is derived—as was mediaeval allegory—from models themselves created in periods of decadence. The concept underlying the stories discussed in this study is, however, truly archaic in that they presuppose a view of the kingship such as is found only in savage and barbaric societies.

In such societies, it will be remembered, the king, like the priest, is thought to be endowed with a frankly supernatural power, divine and holy, which is regarded as a mysterious entity, a sort of fluid substance, which is temporarily vested in the reigning monarch but separable and transferable to another individual. Normally it passes from father to son; but it may be appropriated by a pretender, as the cases of Artachšir and

¹⁸ H. Kern, "De bronnen van 'The Wife of Bath's Tale' en daarmee verwante vertellingen," in *Verslagen en Mededeelingen der Kon. Akad. van Wetenschappen*, IV^e reeks, bd. IX (Amsterdam, 1909), pp. 346-66.

¹⁹ Dio Chrysostomus, *Orat.*, I, 13.

Bahrâm clearly show, or transferred to another dynasty.²⁰ Thus the reigning sultan of Morocco possesses the *baraka* of the sultan-ship, conferred upon him by saints. In recent times Mulai 'Abdl'aziz was believed to have lost his throne because this saintly aid was withdrawn from him. It is on the sultan's *baraka* that the welfare of the whole country depends. When it is strong and unpolluted, the crops are abundant, the women give birth to healthy children, and the country is prosperous in every respect. On the other hand, deterioration or loss of the ruler's *baraka* shows itself in disturbance and troubles, in drought, famine, and other calamities.²¹

The concept in question is fairly wide-spread. Its existence in Ancient Iran is proved by still another series of traditions. The royal majesty or glory (as this mysterious power may be called) of the Iranian kings was known as *Xvarōnah*, O. Pers. *Faruch*, occasionally referred to as *Xvarōnah baghalé* "glory of God."²² It is peculiar to all supernatural beings, to the Sun, the Moon, to Mithra, to the Fravashis, to Verethragma,²³ etc., but also to priests²⁴ and to all legitimate kings; usurpers notoriously lack it.²⁵ When the latter wish to seize it, it escapes from them and hides in the water. Even legitimate kings may lose it by bad conduct, whereupon they are frequently deposed. Thus the *Xvarōnah* left Yima in the form of a raven, the bird of victory, when that monarch strayed from the path of virtue.²⁶ Firdousi

²⁰ E. Westermarck, *The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas* (London, 1912-17), II, pp. 607 ff.

²¹ E. Westermarck, *Ritual and Belief in Morocco* (London, 1926), I, pp. 38 f.

²² F. Justi, *Preussische Jahrbücher*, LXXXVIII (1897), p. 86; James Darmesteter, *Le Zend-Avesta*, II (Paris, 1892), p. 615 (*Annales du Musée Guimet*, t. XXII).

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 562.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 306.

²⁵ This may seem a contradiction to what has been said above on the subject of Artachšir and Bahrâm. In reality it is not; for if the *Xvarōnah* does pass to a usurper he becomes a *successful* usurper, i. e., he ceases to be one, becoming a legitimate king, at least so long as the *Xvarōnah* stays with him.

²⁶ *Yt.*, XIX, 34; cf. F. Spiegel, *Erânische Alterthumskunde*, II (Leipzig, 1873), pp. 42 f.; I (1871), p. 536; Fr. Windischmann, *Zoroastrische Studien* (Berlin, 1863), p. 27; Darmesteter, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 624 ff.; J. Scheftelowitz, *Die altpersische Religion und das Judentum* (Giessen,

relates at length how the same *Xvarōnah*, here called *yezdan* "grace of God," left King Jemshid when the latter refused to recognize God as his superior in power.²⁷

The words of Artachšir's dastūr, the interpretation by Hormuzd IV of Bahrām's vision, to say nothing of the rôle of Lakshmî as *Fortuna Regis*, make it amply clear that this royal *baraka*, this *Xvarōnah*, was thought to assume, on occasion, the shape of a stately ram or of a young woman of superhuman beauty. Its manifestation in animal or human form denoted the impending promotion of the hero to the kingly office, just as its departure in bird shape from Yima, the first Iranian king, indicated that this sovereign had been forsaken by what we should call his "star." Its possession alone assured the king of his continuance in the royal dignity.

The Irish stories which formed the starting point of this study have generally been considered only for their import on a certain Middle English romance.²⁸ The Hellenic, Iranian, and Hindoo parallels pointed out in the present article prove, it would seem, the existence of a concept analogous to the Persian *Xvarōnah* also in Ancient Ireland²⁹ and, since literary borrowings are well-nigh out of the question in this case, its existence in Indo-European antiquity.

ALEXANDER H. KRAPPE.

PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY.

1920), pp. 109 f. As is well known, this feature was transferred to Adam in Hebrew and Arabic tradition; after his fall his "diadem" (*tadj*) flew away; cf. A. Certeux, *Revue des Traditions populaires*, I (1886), p. 162; S. Baring-Gould, *Legends of the Patriarchs and Prophets and Other Old Testament Characters* (New York, 1872), p. 83; W. Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter* (Tübingen, 1926), pp. 409, 490.

²⁷ Firdousi, trad. Mohl, I, p. 38.

²⁸ To the references given in note 3 add: Chaucer, *Works*, ed. F. N. Robinson (Boston, [1933]), pp. 8 and 807; J. L. Weston, *The Legend of Sir Gawain* (London, 1897), pp. 48 ff.; Laura Sumner, *The Weddyng of Sir Gawen and Dame Ragnell*, in *Smith College Studies in Modern Languages*, V (4) (Northampton, Mass., 1924).

²⁹ Cf. also Henri Hubert, *The Greatness and Decline of the Celts* (London, 1934), p. 171.

ON TWO ASTRONOMICAL PASSAGES IN PLUTARCH'S DE ANIMAE PROCREATIONE IN TIMAEO.

1. The following investigations arose from a question of Prof. A. Bidez. He drew my attention to § 31 (1028 F) of the work mentioned in the title, in which Plutarch speaks about a "Chaldean" doctrine according to which the four seasons of the year can be arranged in certain harmonic proportions. The discovery of the unequal length of the four seasons is undoubtedly one of the most fundamental achievements of ancient astronomy because it is equivalent to the discovery of an inequality in the movement of the sun. The explanation of this inequality as apparent by assuming a certain eccentricity of the sun's orbit with respect to the earth is the basis for the ancient theory of the eccentric movements, a theory which finally led to Kepler's discovery of the elliptic orbits of the planets. On the other hand, the cuneiform astronomical tablets of the Seleucid period show that the inventors of these mathematical devices also were fully conscious of the fundamental rôle of an adequate description of the inequality of the movement of the sun in the prediction of the visibility of the moon's crescent and of eclipses. The careful investigation of every ancient statement about the unequal length of the seasons is therefore fully justified.

The first passage in question reads as follows:¹ Χαλδαῖοι δὲ λέγουσι τὸ ἔαρ ἐν τῷ διὰ τεττάρων γίγνεσθαι πρὸς τὸ μετόπωρον, ἐν δὲ τῷ διὰ πέντε πρὸς τὸν χειμῶνα, πρὸς δὲ τὸ θέρος ἐν τῷ διὰ πασῶν. "The Chaldeans say that spring makes a fourth with respect to autumn, a fifth to winter, an octave to summer." These musical harmonies can be represented by the proportions $\frac{4}{3}$, $\frac{3}{2}$, $\frac{2}{1}$, respectively; if we therefore denote the four seasons by s_1 , s_2 , s_3 , s_4 , respectively, beginning with spring as s_1 , then one would offhand interpret the sentence in question as

$$(1) \quad s_1 = \frac{4}{3} s_3 = \frac{3}{2} s_4 = \frac{2}{1} s_2$$

which is obvious nonsense because spring (s_1) is certainly not twice as long as summer (s_2), etc.

On the other hand, spring is actually the longest of the four seasons according to the following inequality:

¹ Plutarch, *Moralia*, VI, ed. Bernardakis, p. 202, 14 (1028 F).

$$(2) \quad s_1 > s_2 > s_4 > s_3$$

while from (1) follows

$$(3) \quad s_1 > s_3 > s_4 > s_2.$$

Plutarch's statement, although undoubtedly incorrect in its interpretation (1), has at least as a consequence the relation (3), which is correct except for the interchange of s_3 and s_2 .

Having found at least a partial justification for Plutarch's statement, we might try to replace the obviously incorrect proportions (1) by some more reasonable expression. Now one need only remark that the four seasons actually differ very little in length in order to realize that all speculations about the relations between the seasons should sooner be directed towards the *deviations* from some constant time interval than towards the lengths of the seasons themselves. In other words, we may assume that the lengths of the seasons are considered as consisting of two parts

$$(4) \quad \begin{array}{ll} s_1 = s + \sigma_1 & s_3 = s + \sigma_3 \\ s_2 = s + \sigma_2 & s_4 = s + \sigma_4 \end{array}$$

namely a common part s and deviations $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_4$. Then the meaning of the sentence in question would be ²

$$(5) \quad \sigma_1 = \frac{4}{3} \sigma_2 = \frac{3}{2} \sigma_4 = \frac{2}{1} \sigma_3.$$

From (5) and (4) follows

$$(6) \quad \begin{array}{l} s_1 = s + 12\sigma \\ s_2 = s + 9\sigma \\ s_4 = s + 8\sigma \\ s_3 = s + 6\sigma \end{array}$$

where s and σ are still undetermined numbers, but common to all four numbers s_1, \dots, s_4 . We therefore must find six unknown quantities s_1, \dots, s_4, s , and σ satisfying the four conditions (6) and in addition to it the obvious relation

$$(7) \quad s_1 + s_2 + s_3 + s_4 = 1 \text{ year.}$$

Thus, with only five equations for six quantities *one* of them can be chosen arbitrarily.

² Here also, of course, we interchange the second and fourth place in Plutarch's statement.

The most natural assumption is evidently $\sigma = 1$, which means that the differences in question are not only multiples of the famous harmonic numbers 12, 9, 8, and 6 but *equal* to these numbers. Making this assumption and adopting $365\frac{1}{4}$ days as the length of one year, one can easily solve (6) and (7). The result, compared with the values accepted by Hipparchus,³ are

$$\begin{array}{ll}
 (8) & s_1 = 82\frac{9}{16} + 12 = 94\frac{9}{16} \qquad \text{Hipparchus } 94\frac{1}{2} \\
 & s_2 = 82\frac{9}{16} + 9 = 91\frac{9}{16} \qquad \qquad \qquad 92\frac{1}{2} \\
 & s_3 = 82\frac{9}{16} + 6 = 88\frac{9}{16} \qquad \qquad \qquad 88\frac{1}{8} \\
 & s_4 = 82\frac{9}{16} + 8 = 90\frac{9}{16} \qquad \qquad \qquad 90\frac{1}{8}
 \end{array}$$

The coincidence is not perfect, yet so close that there can be little doubt that we are on the right track. Thus Plutarch refers to the theory that the following relation holds:

$$\begin{array}{ll}
 (9) & s_1 = s + 12 \qquad s_4 = s + 8 \\
 & s_2 = s + 9 \qquad s_3 = s + 6
 \end{array}$$

which makes the remainders harmonic numbers, respectively yielding fourth, fifth, and octave by their proportions.

That the numbers found do not exactly agree with Hipparchus' values is not surprising. Hipparchus determined the length of the seasons by careful observations and did not hesitate to introduce fractions of days. We have, however, a better chance to find the right numbers by going back to older and less elaborate systems which expressed the length of the seasons by an integral number of days.⁴ And indeed, one of them, the system of Callippus (*ca.* 330 B. C.)⁵ shows a very close relationship to the formulae (9) if we assume $s = 83$. Then we get

$$\begin{array}{ll}
 (10) & s_1 = 83 + 12 = 95 \qquad \text{Callippus } 95 \\
 & s_2 = 83 + 9 = 92 \qquad \qquad \qquad 92 \\
 & s_3 = 83 + 6 = 89 \qquad \qquad \qquad 89 \\
 & s_4 = 83 + 8 = 91 \qquad \qquad \qquad 90
 \end{array}$$

I have no doubt that this contains the solution of our problem. Having realized that the inequality of the seasons according to Callippus can be brought into the form (10) with three har-

³ Ptolemy, *Almagest*, III, 4.

⁴ See e. g. W. B. Dinsmoor, *The Archons of Athens* (Cambridge, 1931), p. 318, note.

⁵ Cf. A. Böckh, *Über die vierjährigen Sonnenkreise der Alten* (Berlin, 1863), p. 46.

monic increments 12, 9, and 6, the Pythagorean philosophers did not hesitate to improve the work of nature by replacing 90 by 91 in order to obtain complete "harmony."

In attributing these speculations to the so-called Pythagoreans, we consider Plutarch's reference to the "Chaldeans" as unhistorical. We know that Babylonian astronomy of the Seleucid period used values for the lengths of the seasons very close to Hipparchus' values⁶ and therefore equally unsuitable to the set (10) of Plutarch's numbers. No traces of a Babylonian theory which could be brought into relation with the number-mysticism of Plutarch's source are preserved. There exists, on the other hand, a certain Greek tradition which assumes the "Chaldean" origin of the harmonic proportions;⁷ here also, proofs of its reliability are lacking.

2. The second passage to be discussed precedes the report about the harmonic qualities of the seasons and deals with the unequal length of the days during the year. We read:⁸ τοῦ δ' ἡλίου περὶ τὰς τροπὰς ἐλάχιστα καὶ μέγιστα περὶ τὴν ἰσημερίαν ἔχοντος κινήματα, δι' ὧν ἀφαιρεῖ τῆς ἡμέρας καὶ τῇ νυκτὶ προστίθῃσιν ἢ τοῦναντίον, οὗτος ὁ λόγος ἐστίν· ἐν γὰρ ταῖς πρώταις ἡμέραις λ' μετὰ τὰς χειμερινὰς τροπὰς τῇ ἡμέρᾳ προστίθῃσι τὸ ἕκτον τῆς ὑπεροχῆς, ἣν ἡ μεγίστη νῦξ πρὸς τὴν βραχυτάτην ἡμέραν ἐμποιεῖ, ταῖς δ' ἐφεξῆς τριάκοντα τὸ τρίτον, τὸ δ' ἡμισὺ ταῖς λοιπαῖς ἄχρι τῆς ἰσημερίας "Because the movement of the sun has its minimum at the solstices and its maximum at the equinox, it subtracts or adds to day and night according to the following proportion: during the first 30 days one sixth of the difference between the longest night and the shortest day is added, one third in the following thirty (days), one half during the rest until the equinox." These sentences obviously contain different astronomical errors. The sun's velocity cannot be a maximum in two opposite points of its orbit and a minimum 90° distance from the maxima. Furthermore, the extremes of the sun's velocity have nothing at all to do with the solstices and equinoxes, which depend only on the inclination of the ecliptic toward the equator; but it is

⁶ Cf. F. X. Kugler, *Babylonische Mondrechnung* (Freiburg, 1900), pp. 83 ff. and O. Neugebauer, *Untersuchungen zur antiken Astronomie*, III, pp. 206 ff. (*Quellen u. Studien zur Gesch. d. Mathem.*, B, III [1938]).

⁷ Cf. Iamblichus, *In Nicomachi arithm. introduct.*, ed. Pistelli, p. 118, 23 f.

⁸ 1028 F = p. 202, 4, ed. Bernardakis.

interesting to notice that here the problem of the inequality of the sun's movement is mentioned, which is the basis for the inequality of the seasons as we have mentioned above. The following remark about the intervals of 30 days is also not quite correct because instead of 30 days one should rather speak about 30 degrees travel of the sun. The final paragraph is the really interesting part, although it too contains an error. The increase of the length of the days from winter solstice to equinox is said to be $\frac{\Delta}{6}$, $\frac{\Delta}{3}$, $\frac{\Delta}{2}$, respectively, if $\Delta = M - m$ (M = longest, m = shortest day). The error here lies in taking Δ instead of $\frac{1}{2}\Delta$, i. e., instead of the difference between the longest day and equinox.⁹ But correcting this carelessness, we obtain a theorem which is well known in Greek time-reckoning, explicitly formulated in Cleomedes, *De motu circulari orbium caelestium*, I, 6.¹⁰ This associates Plutarch, or rather, his source, with a known geographical doctrine, represented not only by Cleomedes but also by Gerbert, Martianus Capella, and *Pap. Michigan*, III, 149, a doctrine which can finally be traced back to Babylonian astronomical tablets of the first, second, and third centuries B. C.¹¹ Plutarch is now the earliest representative of the appearance of this theory in Greek literature.

O. NEUGEBAUER.

BROWN UNIVERSITY.

⁹ This is the inverse error to the first mentioned: the extremes of the sun's velocity were assumed to be only 90° distance instead of 180°; now the increase Δ is taken for diametrically opposite points of the sun's orbit instead of points 90° apart.

¹⁰ Ziegler, p. 50. Cf. Neugebauer, "Cleomedes and the Meridian of Lysimachia," *A. J. P.*, LXII (1941), pp. 344 ff.

¹¹ The details of these relations are discussed in Neugebauer, "On some astronomical Michigan Papyri and related problems of ancient Geography and Astronomy," *Trans. Am. Philos. Soc.*, XXXII (1942). The Babylonian theory referred to is the so-called "system B" in the terminology of the quoted paper.

TWO NOTES ON PINDAR, *ISTHMIAN* I AND VII.

Isthmian I, 67 f.

εἰ δέ τις ἔνδον νέμει πλοῦ-
τον κρυφαῖον,
ἄλλοισι δ' ἐμπίπτων γελᾷ, ψυχὰν Ἀΐδα τελέων οὐ
φράζεται δόξας ἀνευθεν.

All agree that Pindar aims this at the detractors of Herodotus, who ignobly hoard their wealth and deride him for spending his upon athletic sports. But ἄλλοισι δ' ἐμπίπτων γελᾷ has caused trouble. Some explain ἐμπίπτων as "attacking" or even "oppressing," which is most improbable without supporting words, and in presence of γελᾷ. Others translate by "meeting"; but the sense thus gained is very flat, and the verb seems to be used nowhere else of falling in with people, only with things. Some have emended to ἐμπαίζων, (ἄλλοις δ') ἐνιλλώπτων, and ἐν πόνοις. Rather we should take ἄλλοισι as governed by γελᾷ¹ and with ἐμπίπτων understand πλούτῳ from πλούτον in the preceding verse: the miser *defosso incubat auro*. An excellent sense thus emerges: "he hoards his wealth secreted at home and laughs at others while he embraces it."²

Isthmian VII, 31 ff.

The μάτρωσ δμόνυμος of Strepsiadas is said to have died

μαχατὰν
αἰνέων Μελέαγρον, αἰνέων δὲ καὶ Ἑκτορα
Ἀμφιάραόν τε,

where Amphiaraus is entirely out of place.¹ The feeble pallia-

¹ The bare dative with γελᾷ is frequent enough when one laughs at things, e.g. Sophocles, *Ajax* 957, Euripides, *Tro.* 406, Aristophanes, *Clouds* 560. For persons, the regular construction is e.g. ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἡδὺ γέλασαν (*Iliad*, II, 270). I can find but one parallel to the Pindaric phrase as I understand it: Philemon, frag. xiv ab (Meineke), ὅταν ποτ' ἀνθρώποισιν ἡ τύχη γελᾷ.

² Cf. Horace, *Sat.*, I, 1, 66 f.

¹ Fennell writes: "The allusion to Amphiaraos is . . . not open to

tives quoted in note 1 will not satisfy those who consider: (i) that the scholiast's paraphrase² mentions Meleager and Hector, but conspicuously omits Amphiarus; (ii) that he did not die in defence of his country—which is clearly the point; (iii) that he was not merely an invader, but an invader of Thebes, the very town which Strepsiadidas defended; (iv) that he did not die at all. Emendation is inevitable. But Bergk's ἀν' Ἀμφιάρειον ("near the shrine of Amphiarus") not only destroys the metre³—as to which, however, Bergk had his own view; it gives a very poor sense,⁴ damaging, indeed, the noble simplicity of the passage. Bury's ἀμφ' Ἀμφιάρειον adds to this failure a monstrous cacophony, which is the last fault one would have expected from a scholar whose taste in poetry was remarkably fine and alert. Hartung's ἀμφὶ πατρώα γᾶ is better, but not attractive, for the idea has been stated in the preceding πρὸ φίλας πάτρας (v. 27). Rather we should read ἀντιφερίζων τε, "and rivalling"⁵: the participle would reinforce αἰνέων and would find strong support in the paraphrase of the scholiast, ἐν ἐπαίνῳ τιθέμενος Μελέαγρόν τε καὶ Ἑκτορα καὶ τὰς τούτων ζηλῶν ἀρετάς.

GILBERT NORWOOD.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO.

serious objection . . . If Strepsiadidas fell near Amphiaros' shrine, that would quite account for the mention of the hero." But (to say nothing else) why αἰνέων? Christ is reduced to the feeble remark: "suspiciari licet Strepsiadem quoque vatem fuisse ideoque Amphiarum vatem magno in honore habuisse." Wilamowitz (*Pindaros*, p. 412) suggests that, since Amphiarus lives on as a hero and knows that his son Alcmaeon will conquer, "der eine Name genügt, Gedanken und Hoffnungen zu wecken, die auszusprechen sich nicht schickte." Coppola (*Introd. a Pindaro*, p. 202), quoting *Pyth.* VIII, 39 ff., offers the same hopelessly far-fetched idea. Farnell (I, p. 280) does hardly better, being able only to remark that Amphiarus was a righteous man, and "had in fact become endeared to the Thebans, his spirit now being part of the Theban land." But we cannot assume that his presence as a *ἥρως* made him a favourite figure of Theban history.

² Quoted below.

³ As I see it, and as it is given by Christ, Schroeder, and Puech.

⁴ "Putida haec diligentia geographica esset in poeta res, quae ad animum commovendum nihil afferant, suo iure neglegente" (Christ).

⁵ The verb is found in *Pyth.* IX, 50.

THE SHIPWRECKED SLAVER.

The two villains of Plautus' *Rudens*, Labrax the greedy pander and his disreputable accomplice Charmides, do not appear until line 485. Then they come up the cliff, still dripping and shivering from their shipwreck. The scene begins and ends with ordinary dramatic conversation: they curse their luck and each other, they lament their losses, and they fit the end of their conversation neatly into the plot by remarking that things would not be so bad if the girls had not been drowned. (The girls have of course escaped; and thirty seconds later Sceparnio enters, loudly asking the audience what has come over the two girls who are weeping in the temple.)

The middle of the scene, however, has nothing to do with the plot. It is a series of disjointed jokes, usually just two lines long. Both Labrax and Charmides step quite out of character when they exchange remarks like:

535 LA. Suppose I joined a circus, as an ogre!

CH. Why?

LA. Why, because my teeth keep clashing loudly!

At the beginning and end of the scene, Labrax is much too miserable to offer jokes for Charmides' amusement, and, even if he were not, Charmides is much too miserable to ask him to explain them. Both the matter and the form of this particular joke are Roman anyhow, not Greek—the ogre (*Manducus*) was the clown who walked in processions wearing a big head with movable jaws. The other jokes in this section too are fairly obviously Roman. Fraenkel¹ describes the whole passage (516-539) as a "coarse expansion" of the original, made by Plautus himself. If it is cut out, he says, the scene will run straight on from 515 to 540.

That is probably true. But we must not be led by this to imagine that a poet so versatile as Plautus was content merely to translate the rest of the scene phrase by phrase from his Greek original and to add nothing of his own until he came to a place where twenty-five lines of "gagging" could be inserted. For instance, the first speech of Labrax opens with a gentle joke

¹ *Plautinisches im Plautus*, p. 112.

about the dangers of associating with Neptune (485-8), and goes on to a stronger one, which no one now understands because the myth is lost (489-490):

How smart of you, Liberty, to refuse
ever to go to sea with Hercules!

(This is a double-edged joke. In the first place, the comparison between the miserable human castaway and the wise if somewhat abstract deity is funny; and, secondly, it is ridiculous to hear the slave-dealer praising Liberty.)

A little later there is another joke which has always seemed rather pointless. Labrax suddenly says:

510 LA. Oh dear, I feel so bad. Please hold my head!
CH. I really wish you'd spew out all your lungs.

Evidently, Labrax is sick on the stage, suddenly and very briefly. In the very next line, however, he has recovered, and is, like Shylock, lamenting his ducats and his daughters:

512 LA. Palaestra, Ampelisca, where are you now?

Now, what is the point of line 510? Line 511 accepts the fact that Labrax is being sick and makes a little cruel fun of the fact. But line 510 looks as though it were meant to be funnier than it is.

In the first place, Plautus and his audiences (and doubtless his originals) did not think it was funny to see people being sick on the stage. Aristophanes is full of gross jokes about such acts—they are described, or actually performed, in elaborate detail. But throughout Plautus and the fragments of Roman comedy there is not one other scene in which a character is actually seen performing one of the coarser physical functions. There are in fact only nine or ten indirect references to vomiting in the plays;² and they are mostly brief scurrilous threats, like *Cas.* 732:

potin a me abeas
nisi me uis
uomere hodie?

The nearest thing to the incident in the *Rudens* is *Pseudolus* 952:

² *Amph.* 329, *Curc.* 74 and 688, *Merc.* 389 and 575, *Most.* 652. Mimes, of course, are different: cf. Pomponius, frag. 130 (Ribbeck).

Ps. credo, animo malest
 aedibus.
 SIM. quid iam?
 Ps. quia edepol ipsum lenonem euomunt.

Still, although that is not a drawing-room joke, it is not a physical act.

Second, it is not even very appropriate for Labrax to be suddenly seasick, and as suddenly to recover, in the middle of a conversation. He has been out of the water for about twenty minutes—long enough to climb up the cliff and speak the first lines of the scene. If he were seriously sick from the effects of the wreck (as Sosia says he is from the voyage in *Amph.* 329), more would be made of it; both Labrax and Charmides make a great deal of the dampness and chills which afflict them, from 523 to 536.

Therefore there may be something more in the joke than meets the eye. Let us look at the lines before it. Charmides tops off a rather random exchange of well-earned abuse by an allusion to the dinner at which (497, 501) he became the guest-friend of Labrax:

508 CH. scelestiozem cenam cenaui tuam
 quam quae Thyestae quondam aut posita est Tereo.
 LA. perii, animo male fit. contine quaeso caput.

Now, the feast of Thyestes (like the feast of Tereus), at which he ate the corpses of his own children, was the climax of the saga. Both banquets were often described by poets and portrayed by tragedians. The scene is always conceived in the same way: Thyestes (or Tereus) dines in state, encouraged by his treacherous host. Immediately after the feast, he is told that he has eaten his own children's flesh. At once he leaps up, and either vomits it out or tries to do so. The poets describe this act with varying degrees of realism, according as they are grandly truthful like Aeschylus, or subtly sophisticated like Seneca. Here are the most notable descriptions of it.

κάπειτ' ἐπὶ γνῶνός ἐργον οὐ κατὰ ἴσιον
 ὤμωξεν, ἀμπίπτει δ' ἀπὸ σφαγῆν ἐρῶν.

Aeschylus, *Agam.* 1598

quis hic tumultus uiscera exagitat mea?...
 uoluuntur intus uiscera, et clusum nefas
 sine exitu luctatur et quaerit fugam.

Seneca, *Thy.* 999, 1041-2

et modo, si posset, reserato pectore diras
egerere inde dapes immersaque uiscera gestit.

Ovid, *Met.*, VI, 663 (of Tereus)

Ovid and Seneca, of course, could not say anything so drastic as Aeschylus' ἀπὸ σφαγῆν ἐρῶν, and they have converted it into the victim's wish to cut himself open: Seneca in a peculiarly disgusting epigram says "ferro liberis detur uia." But it is perfectly clear what the original dénouement was. Neither Thyestes nor Tereus committed suicide; they could not calmly continue with the process of digestion: they must therefore have behaved as Aeschylus says.

Parodies of tragedy are of course extremely frequent in Plautus.³ They are mainly verbal reminiscences.⁴ But sometimes they are allusions to the plot and stage effects of a recently produced tragedy: as in this very play (line 86), where Sceparnio explains to the audience how violent was the storm which knocked the tiles off his master's roof (and caused the shipwreck), by saying

non uentus fuit, uerum Alcumena Euripidi.

I suggest that the rather flat line 510, with the imitation vomiting which accompanied it, was a parodic allusion to the feast of Thyestes or Tereus. As soon as Labrax hears the monstrous banquet mentioned, he vomits—as the unhappy father had done in the tragedy. Of course the tragic poet would not show anything like this on the stage; but he would have it described by a messenger; while for Plautus' audience the joke of seeing what the tragedian had only described would justify its coarseness.

It is unfortunately impossible to tell what tragedy Plautus was parodying in this passage. Livius Andronicus wrote a *Tereus*, which must have been produced before his death *ca.* 204. Ennius' *Thyestes* appeared in 169 (Cicero, *Brut.* 78), which is too late for Plautus to have parodied it here.⁵ There is no surviving

³ Kiessling thought the parodies were all in Plautus' originals: *Analecta Plautina*, I, p. 14; II, p. ix. Leo, *Plautinische Forschungen*, p. 132. Fraenkel, *Plautinisches im Plautus*, pp. 67 f., 88 f.

⁴ *Bacch.* 933 and 1053, *Cas.* 621, *Pseud.* 703, *Rud.* 523, *Stich.* 365, and *Truc.* 931 are some of the more notable examples, with, of course, the prologue to the *Poenulus*. See Ribbeck, *Quaestiones Scaenicae*, p. 352.

⁵ Ribbeck, *Röm. Trag.*, p. 202, suggests that its climax was the entry of Thyestes after the feast, fragments II and VIII.

fragment of Roman tragedy describing this scene. But both Plautus and his audiences knew the legends (that of Tereus is alluded to once again in the *Rudens*, at 604), and it can only have been from Roman tragedies that they knew them. Even as explained, the joke is not very good; but it is rather better than it has hitherto been thought to be.

GILBERT HIGHET.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

CORRECTION TO THE NOTE ON MENANDER'S
EPITREPONTES, VOL. LXII, pp. 355 f.

A friend has called my attention to the fact, which he illustrates with many examples,¹ that use of the phrase *πρὸς θεῶν* is strictly confined to imperative and interrogative clauses² and that it is never placed at the end of a sentence of any length. It follows that the punctuation which I had suggested for line 725 cannot stand and that a new sentence must begin with *Πρὸς θεῶν καὶ δαιμόνων*. So far, then, the editors are right.

I see no reason, however, to follow my correspondent all the way and revert to the distribution as printed by A. Körte or others. The bulk of my argumentation, I should think, remains unaffected, and I still feel that it was a mistake to assign to Onesimus most of the speech which the papyrus gives to Smicrines in lines 722-25. The sequence, then, must be as follows. Smicrines, after insisting on the righteousness of his intention (**Εγωγε—θαυμαστὸν οἶον*), is about to continue: "In the name of the gods and daemons,³ let me go about my business" when Onesimus breaks in with his lecture on the gods' unconcern with human affairs.

HERMANN FRÄNKEL.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY.

¹ He also quotes, as a parallel to the unusual combination *πρὸς θεῶν καὶ δαιμόνων*, [Demosth.], 42, 17: *πρὸς τῶν θεῶν καὶ δαιμόνων*.

² A possible exception is Menander, *Perikeir.*, 401, apparently an exclamatory use. Actual exceptions seem to be rare: Euripides, *Hippol.*, 219 (Aristophanes, frag. 51 Kock); Anaxilas, frag. 27 Kock.

³ The sequence **Ηράκλεις—πρὸς θεῶν* is paralleled in Aristophanes, *Ach.*, 94 f. Cf. also *Equ.*, 1390.

REVIEWS.

FÉLIX PEETERS. *Les Fastes d'Ovide, Histoire du Texte*. Brussels, Librairie Falk Fils, 1939. Pp. 514.

This is without any doubt the most exhaustive work of description ever dedicated to the text of Ovid's *Fasti*. M. Peeters' book contains lengthy chapters on the *Fasti* in antiquity, in the Middle Ages, in "modern times," and at the present moment. These are followed by chapters on the classification of the MSS, on the MS G (Bruxellensis 5369 = Gemblacensis); finally in the last chapter there is a very full "Histoire du Texte." There are also appendices, a formidable stemma printed map-like "hors-texte," and several ample indices and bibliographies.

The kernel, however, is without question Peeters' classification of the MSS the chief feature of which is his high estimate of the Brussels MS (G). In fact his work is in the main an elaborate description and panegyric of G to which most of the other material is appropriately introductory or complementary.

The re-discovery of G is certainly the greatest recent event in the higher criticism of the *Fasti*. Its readings were long known only in the form of Heinsius' citations of certain marginalia written in an Aldine text (itself unknown till its discovery at Leyden in 1910 by De Vries). Kugener's rediscovery of the *Fasti* in G (long known for its Ausonius in another and later hand) and Alton's¹ certain identification of it with the source of the Aldine marginalia (formerly known as the lost *Zulichemianus*) have added to A and U a third MS of capital importance for the text. The question now at issue is the real value of G in relation to A, U, and the rest.²

Peeters does not hesitate to attribute prime importance to G. Rejecting former defenses of the primacy of A and the vagrant eclectisms of Lenz and Landi, he declares roundly: "L'étude de la tradition indirecte nous a forcé à une conclusion assez brutale et presque inattendue: G et ses cognats remontent, sans intermédiaires interpolateurs, à une tradition antique excellente, chrétienne probablement, qui nous donne, du texte proprement ovidien, un fidèle reflet en maints passages capitaux. Les omissions, les déplacements opposent, non seulement G à AU et aux autres représentants importants de la tradition, mais détruisent la notion de 'bon manuscrit' qui s'attachait jusqu'ici à A. Le groupe A, U, D se voit dissocié; des groupes, comme BC, s'en détachent partiellement; U, parfois D, se rattachent à G dont les parents forment autour de lui comme une nouvelle famille, très étroitement unie."³ He thus throws entirely overboard any attempt to establish a single archetype; he rather assumes two main archetypes established in antiquity,—one Ovid's own copy as revised at Tomis and possibly edited by Hyginus and Macer, and the other a vulgate derived from private copies going back to the poet's

¹ E. H. Alton, "The *Zulichemianus*, *Mazaranianus* and other MSS of the *Fasti* of Ovid," *Hermathena*, XX (1926), pp. 101 ff.

² The sigla here used are those of the last Teubner text (ed. F. W. Lenz = Levy [1932]).

³ Peeters, p. 311.

pre-exilic days. Both of these sources were then, according to Peeters, subjected to a reiterated process of conflation starting in antiquity and continuing through the Middle Ages. The stemma thus established is therefore almost indescribably complex,—the only relatively pure and isolated tradition being that represented by the MSS G M I h, etc. of which G is by far the best. The net result of Peeters' work is in effect to make G the successor of A in the contest for priority in *Fasti* MSS.

But is this a necessary conclusion? Must the discovery of G cast such a shade on A and U? And is the only alternative to "Lachmanian rigidity" the great and almost impenetrable complexity of Peeters' stemma?

This is obviously not the place to discuss the matter adequately but it is perhaps worth while to test the validity of Peeters' deductions in a crucial instance, e. g. his refutation of Alton's theory of the relation of A and G. Alton has tentatively proposed a partial stemma in which both A and G come from an archetype α with a hypotheticalal MS ζ as intermediary between α and G. A is thus, according to Alton, the younger brother of ζ , the parent of G. Peeters rejects this explanation mainly because (1) G alone has the lines IV, 136-7 in the first hand, (2) G omits IV, 331-332 while A omits IV, 330, 332, 333; (3) G is quite distinct from the "famille U" by not having VI, 271-276; (4) A U omit II, 203-4; and (5) A and G go back to different archetypes with different numbers of lines per page. Let us take the first point which is also reasonably analogous to the other instances cited.

The lines in question are:

- 135 aurea marmoreo redimicula demite collo,
136 demite divitias: tota lavanda dea est.
137 aurea siccato redimicula reddite collo:
138 Nunc alii flores, nunc nova danda rosa est.

A U omit 136-137 (U adds at foot of page in later hand); G has in the order 138, 137, 136 with lines 136, 137 crossed out.

In interpreting these lines, according to Peeters, Alton's stemma "nous oblige à supposer, dans le seul G, le fait de l'insertion et du déplacement des vers, ce qui est impossible, ou bien dans ζ dont on ne voit pas où il aurait puisé."⁴ This is certainly logic with a vengeance! The omission of ll. 136-7 is of course easily explained i. e. by the similarity of ll. 135 and 137. The omission affected G's exemplar as well as A's, as is shown by the omission in A and the confusion in G. The circumstances are accounted for, therefore, if we assume an error (with marginal or interlinear corrections) in α that affected the scribes of both ζ and A, although in slightly different ways. In general the fact that one MS omits a verse does not necessarily prove its total independence of another that does not. It merely proves that one scribe was in one instance lazier than another either in straight copying or in overlooking a marginal correction. Here the presence of error in both A and G tends strongly to support Alton's hypothesis of a common archetype. This is also true of

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 309.

instance (2) where both ζ and A reproduce slightly differently (as is natural) the original error of *a*.⁵

It is, however, not only on the basis of the omission of lines that Peeters argues for the independence of G and the non-existence of a common archetype; his principal reason is that G shows traces of good readings elsewhere only revealed by the indirect tradition, i. e. by Priscian, Lactantius, Servius, etc. But does this necessarily indicate a tradition quite independent of the archetype of A, U, and the rest? A positive answer to this question ignores the strong probability of early texts with variants in the margin.⁶ Papyrological evidence has pretty clearly indicated that what were once assumed to be mediaeval variants in our texts are in many cases of ancient origin. This consideration, however, hardly warrants the assumption of several independent MS traditions unless there seems to be very clear evidence that the ancient variants were not assembled in some ancient or early mediaeval "variorum edition." When there is elsewhere evidence for a common archetype—as is the case with the *Fasti*—the supposition of a "variorum edition" becomes the most probable available hypothesis.

Peeters of course makes an attempt to dispose of all the evidence used by scholars such as Krueger, Peter, Landi, Lenz, and Alton to prove the existence of this common archetype. But here again his reasoning is extremely difficult to follow. "Ces cas allégués," he says,⁷ "se réduisent à néant par des considérations paléographiques ou par la possibilité d'expliquer, d'une manière différente, mais au moins aussi satisfaisante, l'origine de l'erreur commune." Thus he explains the capital common error of A U D G, etc. in III, 430 (*Vtiouis* for *Veiovis*) as "*Majuskelkorruptel* tres ancienne et commune à toute la tradition."⁸ But this is in fact a tacit admission of the existence of an archetype (even if majuscule), unless Peeters believes the error *Vtiouis* existed independently in the two MS traditions that go back to Ovid's own time! As for Peeters' refutation of Alton's reasoning for a common minuscule archetype of G and A on the basis of the *duro-vestro* reading (IV, 692) we can only say that it is difficult for us to understand.

Briefly stated, in the line (IV, 692) *rus breve cum duro parca colona viro*, M G read *vestro* for *duro* and A omits the *cum*. Alton supposes that in G's and A's minuscule archetype the scribe first omitted and then added *cum* (abbreviated *c̄*) above the line, and that

⁵ Points 3, 4, and 5 cannot be discussed here. I have already indicated something of the way in which 3 and 4 might be interpreted; such variations in no way disprove a common origin. As for 5, the "different archetypes" in question may well be intermediary MSS such as must be assumed in any stemma.

⁶ Peeters (p. 395) attempts to refute this thesis by trying to show that few of the so-called "variants" can be real or ancient. But he hardly makes his case. After a list of some of the most striking "variants" of this sort he merely says: "les cas sont douteux et d'autres explications se présentent." It is important to remember that—in any stemma—A and G must be widely separated. It is also important to avoid confusion of "Ovidian variants" with the variants of a supposed variorum archetype. They have nothing in common.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 396.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 312.

therefore A overlooked it and G supposed it to be a correction of the *d* in *duro*, hence writing *cum vestro* (*c̄ v̄ro*—the bar over *c* being prolonged to extend over the *v* of *vro*). This neatly explains both the omission of *cum* in A and the reading of G.

To this clear reasoning Peeters responds as follows: "Sans insister sur l'in vraisemblance de *uro* lu: *vestro* [sic!] et d'un *duro* compréhensible corrigé en *cum vestro*, nous proposons une autre explication tout aussi simple et plus logique: le *duro* écrit avec un *d* oncial aurait été pris pour *cūro* (*cum vestro*). Dans ce cas la barre du *d* pouvait parfaitement être interprétée comme s'étendant sur *uro* (*vestro*), puisque sur la même ligne."⁹ But this much more unlikely supposition (the arbitrary importation of an uncial *d*) fails entirely to explain the omission of *cum* in A! These instances may suffice to illustrate Peeters' reduction of the archetype theory to "néant par des considérations paléographiques."

Be that as it may, Peeters has at least assembled such an array of excellent and defensible G readings that no student of the text of the *Fasti* can hereafter ignore them. Until indeed we have the definitive edition of Alton based on his herculean actual and projected examination of most of the existing MSS we can at least attempt to reconstruct a tenable working stemma for the relationship of A, G, and U with due attention to D C B (M and Y can help us supply deficiencies in G and U). Though such a stemma can hardly be as "G-centric" as Peeters' in effect is, we can at least accept certain of his conclusions in regard to the relative positions of G D U. A is written in a ninth century Carolingian script, U in early eleventh Beneventan, G in early eleventh century minuscule which shows traces of a South Italian exemplar.¹⁰ Peeters would explain the affinities of A and U as due to conflation and "tripartition"¹¹ rather than direct descent from a common origin. More probable in my opinion is the hypothesis of a common insular¹² archetype with French (A) and Italian descendants, the latter being the ancestor of D U G.¹³ It is therefore important at this stage of the business to emphasize once again that A and U both have great value and that G's agreements with the indirect tradition do not necessarily mean too much. The importance of U is brought out by the famous VI, 271-276 passage, which—whether spurious or not—can be no recent interpolation and hence is good evidence for the independent value of U. In my opinion the passage is quite genuine.

Such criticism will not, I hope, lead anyone to underestimate the importance of Peeters' book. Besides his full account of G and its

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 314.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 261, n. 6.

¹¹ Peeters assumes that the two different sources (Φ and Ψ), after some preliminary conflation, ultimately become three sources (Γ , Δ , H), Γ and H coming from Φ and Ψ respectively but Δ being the result of the convergence of both Φ and Ψ .

¹² G certainly shows abundant insular traits. A more careful study of the other MSS is, however, desirable before the hypothesis of a common insular origin is adopted. Possibly the archetype was Italian. Photographs of A U G and D are shown in Frazer, *Fasti* (1929), Vol. V, Plates 1-4.

¹³ This does not agree with Peeters' stemma as it abandons the ideas of a double archetype and of later "tripartition." See note 11 *supra*.

relation to the stemma, he gives us, as I have indicated, a valuable history of the origin and influence of the poem. This is up to date the fullest and ablest discussion of this subject.

Peeters' treatment of Ovid himself is full and well documented. I cannot agree with his comparative estimates of the literary value of *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*. The *Metamorphoses* seems to me the self-confessed *chef d'oeuvre* of Ovid with a real unity despite its superficial formlessness, as I have tried to prove elsewhere.¹⁴ Certainly many classical scholars would say that Ovid abandoned the elegiac meter and style at least partly because he had a more serious purpose than the limits of that meter and style allowed.¹⁵ Heinze has developed an impressive argument for this thesis—and in that very work which Peeters quotes in proof of the opposite conclusion.¹⁶ This again seems to be a case of somewhat overrating the thing about which one is writing—the values of both *Fasti* and the Brussels MS are relative.

The discussion of Ovid in the middle ages is very useful although based primarily on secondary materials. In contrast, the careful description of the scholia in the Brussels MS throws new light on the subject and is a real addition to Alton's former work on it.¹⁷ Peeters now distinguishes two types of scholia: one in a majuscule or Merovingian minuscule of a size approximately similar to that of the text proper; the other in a definitely smaller minuscule hand. The former seems to go back to an ancient commentator; the latter is mediaeval and very probably the work of Sigebert of Gembloux, whence of course the MS originated. We would hazard the guess that these earlier scholia (marginal annotations, titles, fabulae, etymologies, etc., partially based on Festus) are very probably the remains of that old edition which was the basis of our supposed archetype with variants. Precisely the same thing can be said of scholia embalmed in the so-called Lactantian *Argumenta* in the MSS of the *Metamorphoses*.¹⁸

The "Histoire du Texte" chapter contains a good discussion of "Ovidian" variants; Peeters' skepticism on this subject seems well advised.¹⁹ His discussion of the missing six books (VII-XII), the sources of the poem, and many other points is full, lucid, and convincing. His estimate of his predecessors is shrewd and kindly. If Lenz and Landi failed to escape a confused eclecticism, if Frazer

¹⁴ Cf. *T. A. P. A.*, LXIX (1938), pp. 188 f.

¹⁵ Hence I would disagree with Peeters by dating the bulk of the *Fasti* definitely before that of the *Metamorphoses*.

¹⁶ Peeters, p. 16, n. 3. Peeters here claims that Heinze (*Ovids elegische Erzählung*) "marque nettement la supériorité des *Fastes* sur les *Metamorphoses*." I would say that Heinze does, if anything, the opposite. Cf. his statement (p. 71): "Ovid mit seiner lebhafteren Phantasie, seiner Freude an der Bewegung und den Farben des bunten Lebens ist viel reicher als Virgil an sinnlichen Eindrücken und hat viel mehr den Trieb, sich selbst und dem Hörer sichtbare Bilder vor Augen zu führen. In seiner elegischen Erzählung tritt das freilich ganz zurück; aber in den Metamorphosen schwelgt er in der Erfindung und Ausmalung solcher Bilder."

¹⁷ *Hermathena*, XX (1926), pp. 119 ff.

¹⁸ Cf. my article "The *Argumenta* of the so-called Lactantius," *H. S. C. P.*, XLVII (1936), pp. 131 f.

¹⁹ Cf. note 6 *supra*.

unfortunately was unable to profit by Alton's identification of G and Z—there is at least no excuse for such things now. Nor does Peeters fail to pay his debt to Alton, even if he perhaps fails to appreciate the worth of Alton's work at all points. That is why we can all rejoice in the prospect of a new Budé *Fasti* edited by Peeters himself. And may his text be better than his stemma!

BROOKS OTIS.

HOBART COLLEGE.

H. W. PARKE. *A History of the Delphic Oracle*. Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1939. Pp. viii + 457; 8 plates.

Professor Parke deserves our thanks for having written the first complete history of the Delphic Oracle from earliest times down to the fourth century A. D. It was a tremendous task to gather and sift all the literary, epigraphic, and archaeological evidence upon this famous shrine. Outside of Athens, what other place in Greece can offer as much material to the historian as Delphi? And Professor Parke, with some trifling exceptions, has introduced into his book all the evidence that is relevant to the oracle.

He divides his book into three parts. The first considers the origin and procedure of the oracle and the sources of the oracle's history; the second, which is more than half the entire book, presents the history of the oracle from the colonization period to the fourth century A. D. in half-narrative, half-scholarly form; the third considers the relation of the oracle to the mythology, religion, ethics, and private life of the Greeks.

It is to be expected that no two "Delphians" would treat so vast and important a subject in the same way or arrive at the same conclusions about all problems. Much of what I shall have to say of Professor Parke's book, therefore, will be a statement of my own differences in matters where a third "Delphian" might very well agree with Professor Parke.

The chapter on the origin of the oracle can hardly be criticized for shedding no new light upon the darkness in which the subject lies; that Ge held the site before Apollo is all that is certainly known. But Professor Parke provides us with an interesting discussion of the several traditions and of the place of Ge, Poseidon, Dionysus, and the Sibyl at Delphi.

The same thing can be said of the chapter on the procedure of the oracle. It contains nothing new, but the discussion of the evidence is interesting and complete. Professor Parke is certainly right in adopting the view that there was no chasm beneath Apollo's adytum nor any subterranean vapor that issued from a cleft in the rock but that there was a chamber below the floor of the adytum into which the Pythia could have descended. The discussion of fraud in the operation of the oracle is unsatisfactory. It is a difficult question, of course; but Professor Parke seems to pit conscious fraud against sincerity coupled with self-deceit and believes that there

was very little of the former. He has not considered unconscious fraud, an intent to deceive that the deceiver hides even from himself beneath an exterior of rationalization and sincerity. The only question then is whether the oracle was fraudulent or genuine; i.e., genuine in the sense of actually possessing occult knowledge of events distant in time or space. It is my conviction that the priests and Pythia possessed no occult knowledge at any time. The whole question is a fascinating one; a study of the pious fraud in the Mediterranean world, ancient and modern, is greatly needed.

After discussing the origin of the oracle, Professor Parke plunges at once into the period of colonization. He has almost nothing to say of the oracle in the Greek middle ages. Granted that the evidence is scanty, there is more to say than Professor Parke has said. Later in the book (p. 319) he fails to see the real meaning of the oracle that was given to Agamemnon at the beginning of the Trojan war (*Od.*, VIII, 73-82). At least he fails to make it clear that the quarrel foretold in the oracle was the great quarrel of the *Iliad* between Agamemnon and Achilles, and that Agamemnon was mistaken in supposing that the oracle was fulfilled in the quarrel between Achilles and Odysseus.

My chief difference with Professor Parke arises over his judgments on the genuineness or spuriousness of oracles reported in Greek and Latin literature. Though he considers an exact ambiboly spurious (p. 43), he is inclined to be lenient and allow as genuine or partly genuine a great number of dubious responses. He says (p. 42) in his discussion of the sources of the oracle's history that he accepts many responses that have hitherto been doubted as post-eventum prophecies; at least, that the quoted response bears some relation to the original response given before the event. In consequence he accepts as genuine many responses quoted by Diodorus Siculus, Pausanias, Plutarch, Aelian, and Athenaeus, most of which, in my opinion, cannot possibly be accepted as historical. Particularly unfortunate, I feel, is his acceptance of the oracles quoted by Eusebius from Porphyry's *De philosophia ex oraculis haurienda* (pp. 381-383, 420). These long-winded oracles are certainly spurious; it has been thought that many were the product of Alexander of Abonuteichos; see E. H. Gifford's edition of Eusebius, *Praeparatio evangelica* (Oxford, University Press, 1903), IV, pp. 141 f., and the citations given there. The reasons that Professor Parke gives for accepting many oracles are far from cogent. Let us consider a few instances.

P. 73. Professor Parke considers the second oracle to Croton (Diodorus Siculus, VIII, 17) genuine on the ground that the list of place-names contained in it are an improbable invention for a forger. But is it probable that a response given before the founding of Croton would show such great familiarity with place-names in and around Croton? And is it not likely that a forger would introduce place-names in order to gain credence for his invention?

P. 75. Again, I am not impressed by Professor Parke's argument that one version (Athenaeus, XII, 520A) of the oracle on the fall of Sybaris is genuine. He argues that the prophecy (that

the Sybarites' prosperity would end when they honored a mortal above a god) deals in generalities and is not like the oracle of Herodotus, I, 55, in being only intelligible in terms of its fulfilment. Here and elsewhere Professor Parke believes that Delphi shot in the dark, putting forth a sufficiently general statement that could be interpreted in the light of later events. But is it not obvious that this prophecy is written with the story of the Sybarite and his slave in mind? Is the prophecy really so unspecific as Professor Parke says? Moreover he fails to see that the profanation of Hera's altar is the kernel of all versions of the Sybaris story (see Aelian, *V. H.*, III, 43; Plutarch, *Mor.* 557C). Clearly these stories have something to do with the cult of Hera at Sybaris. We have here a cult-myth into which the Delphic oracle is brought in a conventional way. See Professor Parke's own remarks on the use made by myth-makers of the Delphic oracle as the best-known source of oracles (p. 299).

In the majority of instances, however, Professor Parke does not find the colonization oracles genuine (p. 86). He also rejects the oracles on Sparta's Messenian war and the Croesus-oracles of Herodotus. But if he sees that these are the stuff that legends are made of, why does he accept the Tegean oracles given to Sparta (pp. 110-112)? Are they not plain cases of responses that are intelligible only in terms of their fulfilment?

Pp. 184 f. I am not sure that we have in the "wooden walls" oracle to Athens (Herodotus, VII, 141) an undoubtedly original utterance of Delphi, as Professor Parke supposes. It appears to me to be written with full knowledge of the Themistoclean walls and the victory at Salamis. The only question is how a forged oracle would be accepted as genuine in perhaps less than one generation after the event. But this was possible, I believe, under the conditions of the time.

P. 201. Certainly the oracle on the foundation of Thurii was written with full knowledge that at Thurii there was a spring called *Medimnos*. It is impossible to suppose that Delphi had spoken words in reference to the scantiness of water in southern Italy, only to have its words given a more specific interpretation. The source is Diodorus Siculus (XII, 10, 5).

Pp. 220 f. The oracle on the death of Lysander is another case of the same sort: there was a river near Haliartus called *Hoplites*. It seems clear on the face of it that Lysander's death by the *Hoplites* suggested a clever story of an oracle that had warned him against a hoplite. Yet Professor Parke says that "the obscurity of the wording seems too great for the forger."

P. 389. As to the question that Glaucus Epicydes' son put to the oracle (Herodotus, VI, 86), whether he might forswear himself for gain, can Professor Parke really believe that anyone in Greece could have seriously asked such a question at an oracular shrine? Was this not a story invented to illustrate the terrible consequences of breaking one's oath? See p. 399 on cautionary tales.

P. 406. The Telesicles oracle is not likely to be genuine. Professor Parke accepts it in spite of the fact that it contains the motive

of the "first to be met." But this motive is not to be found in any certainly genuine oracular response. Moreover the oracle is quoted by Eusebius, all of whose oracles are highly dubious.

P. 419. The silence of Cicero in his own works about the oracle that the Pythia is supposed to have given him as a young man is conclusive. Cicero's character being what it was, we can hardly suppose that he never thought of mentioning it except perhaps in the lost *De Gloria*.

My rejection of these oracles that Professor Parke accepts is based upon a comparison of the certainly genuine oracles, those found in inscriptions and contemporary historians, with those that are certainly fictitious, the oracles that are set in the dim legendary past. Only in this way can criteria be established whereby to decide the genuineness of all other records. Many oracles that Professor Parke accepts are exactly like the legendary oracles and not at all like the certainly genuine group. The latter, in fact, show the oracle's business to have been largely a cut-and-dried affair. There were no clever ambiguities, no revelations of the future in difficult language, no motives of the "first to be met" and "this will happen when such and such happens." No matter what the question, the oracle prescribed the foundation of a cult to states, the making of certain sacrifices to individuals; or it merely ratified plans already decided upon. The sort of business that Socrates in the *Republic* would leave to the Delphic oracle was actually the sort of business that it usually handled. Professor Parke recognizes that the oracle's responses "on questions of religion and cult were among the most important of its activities" (p. 325). But, like Plutarch, he supposes that in the heyday of the oracle it pronounced on momentous questions of state in revelatory terms, that its administration possessed an almost uncanny knowledge of the affairs of the entire Mediterranean area. But though Delphi once had great influence on the city-states, it was not through cleverly phrased responses. Its actual effect on politics was somewhat more devious than that.

On the cautionary Daphnitas story, Professor Parke says that Strabo's allusion to a breastplate in his version (XIV, 647C) is left unexplained (p. 400). But it is likely that the breastplate of Strabo's version replaces the horse of the other version (see Cicero, *De Fat.*, 3).

On the reply to the Emperor Hadrian, when he asked the oracle about Homer's birthplace, Professor Parke says that the oracle's motive in making an answer utterly inconsistent with the Ios legend is obscure (p. 404). But it is probable that Delphi was gratifying Hadrian by accepting a pet theory of his own on the "Homeric question" of that time.

I am not so sure as Professor Parke that Delphi was conspicuously impartial on constitutional questions (p. 431). While it was often opportunistic, and courteous to tyrants, whose purpose was the settlement of class-conflict through dictatorship, it appears to me to have always leaned heavily to the conservative and oligarchic side. Its pro-Persian policy, its favoring of Sparta against Athens, the Thessalian predominance in the Amphictyony, all point towards an

oligarchic bias. We find that it was the oligarchic states and the oligarchic factions in democratic states that had most respect for the oracle. It is another fault of this book that it makes no more than a brief mention of Delphi's relation to the class-conflicts of the Greek city-states. Yet this is rather like writing a history of the Spanish civil war without discussing the land question.

But in spite of shortcomings this is a good book. It is full of sound judgments on the numerous problems that the massive evidence presents. We have here a detailed account of the Delphic oracle throughout antiquity, and we can see how much the history of the oracle was the history of Greece. We learn from it something of what the Delphic oracle meant to an ancient Greek, how it affected every phase of his life.

In conclusion I wish to call attention to the fine plates in the book and to the very useful bibliography and *Index Locorum*.

JOSEPH E. FONTENROSE.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY.

WILFRED L. KNOX. *St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles*. Cambridge, at the University Press; New York, The Macmillan Company, 1939. Pp. xi + 261. \$4.00.

Canon Knox here faces a problem fundamental for the study of Paul and in fact of the whole development of Christianity. How did the eschatological gospel of the Kingdom pass into the theological gospel of the Church? How did he who was "sent" become a cosmic figure, "by whom all things were made"? The greatest crisis which Christianity has ever surmounted was the failure of the Kingdom to appear in visible form—probably above all its failure to appear in the tragic days of the Jewish uprising, the siege and capture of Jerusalem, and the destruction of the Temple: could anything look more like Mark 13? Yet the theology with which this crisis was surmounted was already developed, by Paul, through the application to Jesus of concepts of a divine hypostasis already familiar to Hellenistic Judaism.

The realization of this is not new, but Canon Knox has developed it with a wealth of learning and suggestiveness. Much of what he says is questionable, not a little is forced, and in fact impossible, and I can understand the adverse tone of some reviews.¹ Yet if you will read this book closely, looking up quotations and checking their interpretation (not their accuracy, which is high), you can hardly fail to derive considerable profit.

¹ B. S. Easton, *Anglican Theological Review*, XXI (1939), pp. 210 f.; H. J. Cadbury, *Church History*, VIII (1939), pp. 373 f. For more favorable comment, cf. R. P. Casey, *J. Bibl. Lit.*, LIX (1940), pp. 71 ff.; H. E. W. Turner, *J. R. S.*, XXIX (1939), pp. 252 ff.; M. S. Enslin, *Journal of Bible and Religion*, VIII (1940), pp. 59 f.; L. Cerfaux, *Rev. hist. eccl.*, XXXV (1939), pp. 779 f.

The first chapter, "The Failure of Eschatology," starts with Paul's speech at Athens, and Knox does in fact regard this rebuff as a crucial point in the Apostle's life and as responsible for his change of teaching (or should we say of emphasis?). This I cannot accept. First, while Norden's suggestion that the speech was based on a work of Apollonius of Tyana has been rightly abandoned by its author, his demonstration that the altar "to the Unknown God" did not exist and that the speech is full of Hellenistic common-places² remains unshaken. Paul may have spoken like this; but the fact that Acts says so does not increase the probability that he *did* so speak.³ Secondly, it was not his only failure. Thirdly, on any probable chronology, all his Epistles are subsequent to it; and the real development, as C. H. Dodd showed, begins in 2 Corinthians, and includes an increased emphasis on the idea of reconciliation, a hope of ultimate universal salvation, and a more tolerant appraisal of the values of ordinary life.⁴ In all this there is something of intense personal experience, something of a return to earlier ideas. Paul had grown up in a Judaism which though Hellenistic made far less use than did Philo of Greek philosophy. He could not speak of man as "a creature blended from mortal and immortal nature" (*Praem. Poen.*, 13) or glorify his essential gentleness (*ibid.*, 92); he does not develop the mystery metaphor; he once uses the argument that God is to be known through his works (Rom. 1, 19 ff.), but he shows no trace of the mystical joy in the contemplation of the noblest of those works, the starry heaven, no reverence for nature (*Praem.*, 34: if he ever had this, eschatology killed it), and on the other side no dichotomy of God's functions into mercy and power. Yet he valued the concept of conscience, he liked lists of virtues and of vices; he could accept the antithesis of soul and body⁵ and the concept of the soul's liberation from the body; in Rom. 13, 1 he recognizes established civil authority as of God; and his doctrine of grace has affinities to Philo, whose doctrine of inspiration was no less serious for that it was different.⁶

Knox's chapter surveys pagan as well as Jewish ideas of an impending cosmic catastrophe and urges that in the pagan world such ideas were far less prominent now than a century before. His material here and elsewhere is in need of revision⁷ but interesting.

² Knox, p. 1, n. 2 gives useful parallels from Hellenistic Judaism.

³ Cf. now M. Dibelius, *Paulus auf dem Areopag* (*Sitzungsb. Heidelberg*, 1938/9, ii), especially pp. 52 f.

⁴ *Bull. J. Ryl. Library*, XVIII (1934), pp. 3 ff. (cf. XVII, pp. 3 ff.); cf. Nock, *St. Paul*, pp. 202 ff.

⁵ Nock, *St. Paul*, pp. 166 f.

⁶ On Paul and the Hellenistic synagogue, cf. A. Meyer, *Das Rätsel des Jacobusbriefes*, pp. 99 ff., 296, who notes the practice of allegorizing without bothering to state what is allegorized.

⁷ Thus for instance a conviction of the power of fate came not from political chaos (p. 10) but from physical theory, and in spite of what is said on this page there is little evidence for the idea of immortality in the Hellenistic age proper, before the time of Posidonius and Cicero. To speak of the Cabiri as offering grace to achieve moral dignity (p. 11) is to press the evidence too far and to introduce a Christian accent, as Knox does in his remarks about "conformity" and (pp. ix f.) "a philosophic basis which would justify him in continuing to practise

There follows a chapter on "The Synagogue and the Gentiles" which reconstructs rather freely on evidence mainly drawn from Philo. Here again the careful reader will find useful observations, e. g. pp. 33 ff. on the agreement in reading cosmic symbolism into the high priest's robe⁸ (though to say, p. 34, "the figure of the High Priest has replaced Zeus" goes beyond the evidence and the true explanation seems to me to lie in the desire to make of worship an act shared with the celestial powers and with the universe; *unde cum angelis et archangelis*⁹); pp. 36 f. on the divergence between two versions of a Jewish reworking of an Orphic text; pp. 56 ff. on the possible relation of various glorifications of Sophia to the Hellenistic "Praises of Isis."

Knox's theory involves an early but not impossible date for the "Praises."¹⁰ Yet, while there may have been a psychological need for something like a goddess, the supposition that young Jews had to be protected against the attraction of Isis is venturesome and the comparison (p. 59, n. 1; p. 78, n. 3) of Wisdom 8, 4 with Isis as inventing initiations is incorrect, since *μύστις* means "initiate" i. e. "in the secret of" and not "initiating." Further Ecclesiasticus 24, 13 ff. seems Semitic poetry, like the Odes of Solomon: I cannot see that Wisdom is represented, p. 60 "in the character of the great

the form of religion which attracted him or which he had inherited" (cf. p. 50; p. 53, n. 1): this Entweder-Oder did not exist. P. 14, "the Orphic-Stoic remodelling of the Olympian religion" shows the same lack of feeling for paganism. P. 16, "caring for the gods less than" should be "less or more dear to the gods than" (we need not delete *ἢ μᾶλλον*). Pp. 16-7, the trumpet-blast heard in 88 B. C. might of course be related to Jewish practices and ideas, but it was a natural way in which attention might be thought to have been attracted; in any case, for Etruscan prophecies cf. K. Latte, *Philol.*, LXXXVII (1932), pp. 268 ff. (on Vegoia and on supposedly Etruscan developments parallel to the creation of Hermetic literature and of the Chaldaic oracles). P. 28, n. 4, "dedication of a synagogue to Cleopatra and Ptolemy XV as the great gods who give ear (*ἐπήκοοι*)" is in part an error of Oesterley-Robinson, *History of Israel*, II, p. 411, quoted by Knox. In fact the proseucha was dedicated *on behalf* of Cleopatra and Ptolemy "to the great God who hears prayer": a Hellenized but not unorthodox phrase (*O. G. I.*, 742; note that neither here nor *ibid.*, 96, 726 are the rulers given their cult-epithets). On p. 38 the note supplies no evidence for Orpheus as calling men to wakefulness. In spite of p. 46, n. 5, why should God's fear of rebellion reflect Iranian dualism? On p. 50, Seneca, *N. Q.*, II, 43, 1 cannot come from Posidonius (cf. 54: *nunc ad opinionem Posidonii reuertor*).

I often disagree with Knox on the interpretation of Philo, but there we are *in re lubrica*.

⁸ Cf. F. H. Colson's *Philo*, VI, p. 609. For the interrelations of Palestinian and Alexandrian Judaism note that a Midrashic text protests against the use of the Logos doctrine (L. Finkelstein, *Harv. Theol. Rev.*, XXXI [1938], p. 296, n. 13).

⁹ Cf. Philo, *Virt.*, 72-3 (which offers notable parallels to *Corp. Herm.*, XIII) and the prayers in *Const. Ap.*, identified by W. Bousset, *Nachr. Göttingen*, 1915, as Jewish and discussed by E. R. Goodenough, *By Light, Light*, pp. 306 ff.

¹⁰ The story in Diodorus Sic., I, 27, 6 of the mostly obliterated letters of the supposed Egyptian original is probably a fiction: cf. p. 222, n. 34. The basic text may be decidedly earlier than the verse-form preserved on Andros; cf. O. Weinreich, *D. Lit.-Z.*, 1930, cols. 2028 f.

nature-goddess." In any case, Prov. 8, 22 ff. was a regular Rabbinic proof-text for the identity of Torah and Wisdom.¹¹ The concept was natural: the work of Ezra turned on the understanding of *Torah*, "revelation" not "law"; if you understood the Pentateuch, you would understand everything: that understanding was the virtue at the heart of things—just as to Brahmanic priests the Vedic sacrifice was the act at the heart of things. Yet there is a marked resemblance in form between the praises of Sophia and the praises of Isis, and stylistic borrowing is possible. Aristides in his hymn *To Sarapis* speaks of that god as "adorning the soul with wisdom, which alone shows to men their kinship with the gods, by which we differ from other mortal creatures, which gave to men the concept of the gods themselves and invented temples and solemn rites and all honors and further taught and established laws and the state and all inventions and all arts, and gave the power of distinguishing truth and falsehood, and in a word made life";¹² so even in the context of devotion to the Egyptian gods such language could be applied to the abstract notion of wisdom.

We may note also p. 57, n. 3 and p. 195, n. 2, on the association of the Jewish Pentecost with the giving of the Law; p. 69, on the personification of Sophia in Plato, *Philebus* 30 C and the absence of reference in later writers to it (the treatise was perhaps too difficult: the *Timaeus* and epitomes were enough for simple faith).

In all this there is much that will provoke dissent: e.g. p. 88, "drawn apparently from a source which had greater scruples than Philo naturally displays in the matter of verbosity" with the note "Philo can hardly be responsible for στοχαστέον γὰρ τοῦ μὴ μακρηγορεῖν." To be sure, the phrase hardly represents Philo's practice: but compare *Spec. Leg.*, IV, 78, *Praem.*, 52 (*Virt.*, 16), passages which have nothing else in common; we do not always know our failings and Philo can say this as well as *Spec. Leg.*, IV, 204, "we must not fail to use the same point to bring out more than one moral if possible"—which suggests a fundamental characteristic of cultivated Hellenistic Judaism. It was concerned with edification and not with theology in the stricter sense of the word. What we think of as Philo's theology is the sum total of those ideas and metaphors (mainly, no doubt, unoriginal) which he most frequently used in interpreting revelation (cf. Knox, p. x). In spite of pp. 79 f., Wisdom 9, 15-16 has but a changed echo of σώμα-σῆμα: what is desired is not deliverance "from the burden of the body which crushes down the soul" but knowledge in spite of the handicaps imposed by our physical condition. So Philo, like Posidonius, used the Platonic antithesis of soul and body, without any desire for supernatural deliverance from the body; you must, with the help of grace, pull yourself out of the mire; but there is no yearning to be free of the body; and in general, in spite of *Virt.*, 67, no positive anticipation of disembodied bliss: nothing like the pathos of 2 Cor. 4.¹³

¹¹ G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, III, p. 82, n. 32. H. St. J. Hart's observation (Knox, p. 60, n. 3) on the possible influence of Deut. 4, 6 is noteworthy.

¹² 45, 17, p. 357 Keil; I, pp. 88 f. Dindorf; cf. A. Höfler, *Der Sarsaphymnus des Ailios Aristides*, pp. 53 f.; Plutarch, *De Is. et Os.*, 1 and 60; *P. Oxy.*, 1380, 44 and 124.

¹³ Cf. Nock, *Gnomon*, XIII (1937), pp. 160, 165.

The second half of the book ¹⁴ is an exegesis of much of Romans, 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Colossians, and Ephesians; the title of the last chapter "The Ephesian Continuator" hits the nail on the head. This too needs to be read critically; but this you will certainly read with profit, above all on 2 Corinthians; Knox has thought through this very difficult document, with freshness, insight, and knowledge. Among the Notes at the end that on Greek writers and Persian religion, though interesting, is of less value than those on Jewish influences on magical literature and on the descent of the redeemer, which last deserves special praise; that on Paul and "Mysteries" presents the Old Testament and Rabbinic evidence in a useful way.¹⁵ The indices are admirable.

The Pauline Epistles are in truth writings "in which are some things hard to be understood." Canon Knox has helped us to understand them better.

ARTHUR DARBY NOCK.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

CORA E. LUTZ (ed.). *Iohannis Scotti Annotationes in Marcianum*. Cambridge, Mass., The Mediaeval Academy of America, 1939. Pp. xxx + 244. \$3.50. (*Mediaeval Acad. of America Publ.*, No. 34.)

Martianus Capella's strange work *De nuptiis Mercurii et Philologiae* was extremely popular during the Middle Ages as we know, and his exposition of the *Septem artes liberales* was one of the basic foundations for the tradition of the Trivium and Quadrivium. The extent to which he was studied is confirmed by three commentaries, all belonging to the ninth century and attributed respectively to Dunchad, to Johannes Scotus Eriugena, and to Remigius of Auxerre. Among them that of Johannes Scotus has a particular importance because of its author: his *De divisione naturae* is certainly the most distinguished work of occidental philosophical literature between Boethius and Anselm, and his translation of the works of Dionysius

¹⁴ I discuss this part of the book in *J. Theol. S.*, XLI (1940), pp. 292-4. We may here note à propos of the rabbinical answer to Alexander the Great (p. 99, n. 6) that the text from which it comes is a variant on the traditional answer of the Brahmins to him (U. Wilken, *Sitzungsb. Berlin*, 1923, p. 182, n. 3) and preserves the traditional number of ten questions and ten answers (W. W. Tarn, *The Greeks in Bactria and India*, pp. 428 ff.); for a revised translation cf. L. Goldschmidt, *Der babylonische Talmud*, IX, pp. 665 f.

¹⁵ Knox, p. 224, n. 1 makes Celsus *apud* Origen, *C. Cels.*, II, 31 speak of the Word as son of God; but, in spite of Knox, Celsus is clearly quoting the supposed Jewish opponent and therefore shows evidence of personal acquaintance with Hellenistic Jewish thought. This is a fact of some importance.—Can we take as genuine the supposed "Greek," i. e. pagan, proverb about Philo in Hieronymus, *De Vir. Illust.*, 11 and Suidas s. v. (cf. O. Crusius, *Plutarchi de proverbii Alexandrinorum libellus ineditus*, p. 26: ἡ Πλάτων φιλωνίζει ἢ Φίλων πλατωνίζει)? Or is it simply an adaptation of Numenius *apud* Clement Alex., *Strom.*, I, 22, p. 93, 11 St. τί γάρ ἐστι Πλάτων ἢ Μωσῆς ἀττικίζων?

the Areopagite had a large influence upon later authors. His commentary on Martianus is preserved without the author's name in a Paris manuscript of the ninth century from Corbie (Paris. lat. 12960, ff. 47-115). The attribution to Scotus made by Hauréau and confirmed by Rand is based on solid arguments, since there are contemporary testimonials to his having commented upon Martianus and since some quotations from his commentary given in that of Remigius correspond literally to the text of the anonymous commentary. Some passages of Book IV have been published by Hauréau, and some from Books I-III by Manitius. Miss Lutz now presents the first complete edition of the text along with a philological introduction and some appendices. The work was begun as a doctoral dissertation at Yale University under Professor E. T. Silk.

The commentary consists of a large number of brief Scholia and of some more extensive notes. A large part is devoted to the explanation of glosses as well as to the grammatical, syntactical, and stylistic interpretation of the text. Also metrical and mythological questions occupy a comparatively large space. Much emphasis is given to the allegorical meaning of the myths (cf. the *leges allegorie*, p. 9, 15); but, when such a meaning cannot be found in a satisfactory way, the author speaks with contempt of the *vanissima poetarum deliramenta* (17, 34, etc.). He quotes quite extensively from the Latin classical and late ancient writers. But his knowledge has its limits, of course (Vulcanus e.g. is considered as a brother of Jupiter, 13, 2 ff.). Yet it is interesting to see how much of the classical inheritance was still alive in an author of the ninth century who certainly was one of the most erudite men of his time. His knowledge of Greek is remarkable in spite of incidental mistakes and a rather vague knowledge of classical Greek literature (*Pindarus quidam musicus*, 61, 22). He frequently indicates the textual variants found in different manuscripts of Martianus and thus reveals a marked philological sense of criticism (e.g. 190, 26).

Some of the larger notes are also interesting for their doctrinal content. His remarks on the planetary system and on geography are of interest for the history of science. In philosophy proper he gives much emphasis to the value of human reason (9, 25, etc.) and to the free will (10, 27 ff.). The theory of internal illumination is reminiscent of St. Augustine (13, 12 ff.), while the theory of the eternity of the world is asserted with some caution (10, 28 ff.). The transmigration of souls is rejected (21, 34 ff.), but there are some other reflections of the neo-platonic tradition, e.g. the concept of the world idea inherent in God (42, 35) or the double Venus (67, 3). But his direct knowledge of Plato is apparently limited to the part of the *Timaeus* translated by Chalcidius, and some of his assertions about Plato are quite erroneous (e.g. that he calls the world soul *Entelechia*, 10, 19). Among the notes referring to the seven special fields those on Dialectic are the most characteristic. There is an interesting definition of the *genus* (*genus est multarum formarum substantialis unitas*, 84, 10). *Essentia* is recognized as *generalissimum genus* (84, 11), *substantia* and *essentia* are clearly distinguished (86, 7 ff.). The liberal arts are inherent in the human soul by nature (86, 27 ff. and 87, 10 ff.; in this context we may also mention the thesis that the numbers exist first in the soul and are

there incorporeal, 147, 23 ff.). Scotus refers in this part explicitly to Porphyry's *Isagoge* and to Aristotle's *Categories* and *De interpretatione* (84, 1 ff.), thus indicating that the *Logica vetus* was already in the state of formation. His remarks on logic are also important for a history of philosophical terminology in Latin, which still remains to be written. (Curious enough is this note: *Parmenides locus est ubi Parmenes philosophus philosophatus est et incia huius artis invenit*, 82, 23 f.)

Miss Lutz gives an accurate transcription of the only manuscript traced so far, correcting only the obvious errors and following as a rule a rather conservative method. She even tends to preserve the original orthography, a procedure which seems to me somewhat exaggerated since the MS is not an autograph and since there apparently is no consistent orthography even within the same MS. The Lemmata are numbered in accordance with the last text edition of Martianus (ed. Dick), the quoted passages are carefully identified. Some proposals for a correction of individual passages will be given below.

The introduction gives full information about the bibliography and the problems connected with the text, and some remarks about the content, source, and style of the text, a description of the manuscript, and some indications of the method followed in editing the text. There are three appendices dealing with special questions: with the chronology of the text, with a quotation given from the *Peplus* of Theophrastus, and with the relation between Scotus' commentary and the earlier one attributed to Dunchad. An index concludes the handsome volume, which is certainly of interest both to students of classical antiquity and of mediaeval literature who will have an opportunity to discuss many detailed questions occurring in connection with it.

Corrections for the text.

- 8, 12, *mariti sui* [An]tifonis *interempti* ed., *antifone* cod: read a Tifone (Typhon was not the husband of Isis, but his murderer).
- 10, 7 f., read *Non inrationabiliter quoque Pronoes idest Providentiae maior filiarum esse putatur Divinatio*.
- 10, 33, *videantur*, read *videatur*.
- 11, 23, *rationabiles*, read *rationabilis*.
- 13, 18, *inquirunt*, read *inquirant*.
- 13, 25, *hominum*, read *omnium*.
- 13, 28, *significat*, read *significatur*.
- 14, 2, *inquiri*, *malim* *elevat*.
- 14, 4, The words *quod autem sequitur* belong to the following sentence.
- 25, 10, *venisti*, read *venistis*.
- 25, 32, *Philologiam*, read *Philologia*.
- 29, 13, *suorum consiliorum*, *malim* *suo consilio*.
- 29, 26, the addition *que* is superfluous.
- 29, 31, *valens*, *malim* *valet*.
- 35, 14 ff., The words *quod autem sequitur* belong to the following sentence.
- 44, 25, *dicitur*, read *dicit*.
- 47, 3, *ad tertia*, read *a tertia*.
- 47, 5, *fatigatus*, read *fatigatum*.
- 48, 11, *instabilitas*, read *instabilitate*.
- 65, 29, *pro differentiam*, read *per differentiam* (or *pro differentia*).
- 66, 13 f., Read *Apotheosis mater Athanasiae interpretatur redeificatio*, etc.
- 70, 15, *totius*, *malim* *roris*.

- 95, 1, read substantiam non essentiam; cf. 86, 7.
 95, 7, conservanda, read consideranda; cf. 86, 13.
 98, 13, illorum, read illam; cf. 87, 36.
 108, 18, read Saturnus enim significat annum, Iovis quasi iuvans vitam.
 111, 26, Quaeque nova facit, these words constitute a lemma.
 114, 7 f., accedit, this word constitutes a lemma and goes with the following sentence.
 116, 13, vitiis, read vitii.
 120, 15, rem, this word must be cancelled.
 120, 26, adversus quam intentionem, these words constitute a new lemma.
 124, 16 f., per motionem, read permotionem.
 126, 15, exasperamus, malim exaggeramus.
 126, 27, saepe, malim scilicet.
 127, 32, gestas . . . similes, read gesta . . . similis.
 132, 1, more, malim moris et.
 132, 9, luminis sit, read lumine fit.
 132, 18, principio, read primo; cf. 159, 20.
 133, 5, malim luminis et tenebrarum.
 139, 30, non, read nam.
 141, 28, dulcedinem, read dulcedine non.
 146, 24, autem, read aurum.
 147, 26, before geometria we have to add corporeus.
 150, 15, et modum, read ad modum.
 150, 29, qua ternario, read quaternario.
 156, 5, corpulentia, read corpulentiae.
 157, 13, habet, read habent.
 162, 1, inferioris, read inferiores.
 162, 29, qui, read quia.
 163, 8, ratione, read rationem.
 164, 19, et quasi monas, read est.
 166, 1, vie iectus, read vi eiectus.
 167, 5, Entellus is unobjectionable.
 167, 20, iuvas, malim iuvat.
 173, 2, aut, read autem.
 180, 24, lunaria, read lunaris.
 180, 32, Read longius enim a sole est luna quam terra.
 186, 19, irrata, read irata.
 191, 26, read id est sensus delectatio.
 193, 4, qua si, read quas.
 201, 18, quia, read qui.
 212, 29, corporales, read incorporeales.
 216, 4 ff., read: temporum (habent enim bis terna) et in pedes (habent enim bis iambos et trocheos) resolvuntur, molossi.
 218, 1, qui, read quia.
 218, 3, semanticiis, read semanticius.
 219, 29, unaque is unobjectionable.

PAUL OSKAR KRISTELLER.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

ERIC G. TURNER. *Catalogue of Greek and Latin Papyri and Ostraca in the Possession of the University of Aberdeen.* Aberdeen, University Press, 1939. Pp. xix + 116; 5 plates. 8s. 6d. (*Aberdeen University Studies*, No. 116.)

In 1896 Mr. J. A. S. Grant presented to the University of Aberdeen a collection of papyri most of which came from Dimê (Soeno-

paei Nesus) in the Fayyûm. Attention was called to the collection first in 1907 by Mr. E. B. Winstedt, who published, though inadequately, two dozen of the literary texts.¹ Definitive arrangements for a full publication were made in 1918 when Mr. J. G. Tait undertook to draw up a catalogue of the material. Other duties forced him to relinquish this task unfinished, and in 1937 the present editor, a Lecturer in Classics at the University of Aberdeen, assumed the responsibility of editing the collection.

The papyri and ostraca included in this volume, one hundred and ninety-seven items in all, are arranged according to subject under the following headings: theological fragments, literary and near-literary texts, non-literary texts, documentary ostraca, and summary publications. Under the last rubric are comprehended nearly one hundred fragments, almost all of which are inconsequential. The reason for publishing these shreds is the hope, says Turner, that "custodians of other collections (notably in London, Berlin, or Vienna) may be able to recognize these scraps as parts of texts already known, to which they may be worth-while supplements."

The work of transcribing the original documents was done by Tait; Turner has elucidated their content by means of descriptive introductions, translations (in many instances), and notes on readings of unusual interest or difficulty. Classified indexes and five plates of facsimiles increase the utility of the volume.

One of the most fascinating papyri in this catalogue is number 72A, a fragment which the editor aptly calls "a palæographical puzzle." Assigned to the eighth century, it contains a list of names, not all of which are Greek. Nor are certain other words Greek, though they are written in Greek characters. In addition to Turner's remarks, the following may be added.

Two names in this fragment are found also on a very small papyrus in Preisigke's *Sammelbuch*, I, 4938. Moreover, in Wessely's *Studien zur . . . Papyrskunde*, X, 295 and XX, 264 further parallels occur. In each at least three names are duplicates of those in this papyrus, and in XX, 264 a similar use of dots can be observed, though here they stand at the beginning of the lines. In line 2 of the recto, Διμελ, which is presumably, as Turner says, the Arabic name *Djemil*, may be compared with the phonetically similar Τζαμούλ and its variants listed in Preisigke's *Namenbuch*. In line 6 of the recto, δανηλ surely is a proper name and should be written accordingly. In line 4 of the verso, Χαήλ may be either (1) the second part of [Με]χαήλ, since it occurs at the beginning of the line, and the end of the preceding line has been lost (but this is not likely, for it is not clear that any other name in this fragment is thus divided); or (2) a Semitic name just as it stands (cf. II Esdras 10, 30, *var. lect.*). In the same line read Ἀνδ(ρῆα) ἀδε(λφός), cf. Wessely's *Studien*, XX, 264r, line 4.

Several errors mar the otherwise favorable impression that Mr. Turner's work presents.

Page 2, lines 9 f. The restoration of a reading of the Latin frag-

¹ *Classical Quarterly*, I (1907), pp. 258 ff.

ment of St. John's Gospel is said by Turner to "offer an order of words found elsewhere in Sinaiticus and the Latin MSS. *b, e, l*." This is not so. The only manuscript that presents the restored order is the bilingual codex Bezae, D, in both the Greek and Latin.

Page 7, note to line 18. With regard to the Christian *terminus technicus* οἰκονομία, it would have been helpful to indicate that Ed. Schwartz collected all of the principal texts in early Christian literature which illustrate this word in his *Tatiani Oratio ad Graecos* (1888), pp. 86-91 (= *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, edd. Gebhardt and von Harnack, IV, 1).

Page 7, note to line 19. Not only can it be remarked merely that "the abbreviation χ̅ε̅ρο̅c is noteworthy"; Ludwig Traube in the definitive work on the contraction of sacred names does not list any form that parallels this (*Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters*, II, *Nomina Sacra: Versuch einer Geschichte der christlichen Kürzung* [1907]).

Page 8, line 30. The Greek text of St. Luke 1, 54 is not quoted with strict accuracy according to the critical text of Tischendorf (ed. octava), Westcott and Hort, Souter, or Nestle.

Page 40, note to papyrus no. 40(g). Turner's statement of the date mentioned in *P. Fay.*, 72 ("the twelfth year") is incorrect. It is "the sixth year"; nor does Preisigke's *Berichtigungsliste* alter it.

Page 63, papyrus no. 63. The editor's almost total reconstruction of lines 12-16 is not consistent with the date to which he assigns the papyrus, A. D. 101. Trajan was not given the title "Dacicus" until near the close of 102.

The following are minor corrections and suggestions.

Page 7, bottom. To the bibliography on the ostrakon bearing a hymn to the Virgin might very well be added Sophronios Eustratiades, *Ἡ Θεοτόκος ἐν τῇ Ὑμνογραφίᾳ* (Paris, 1930).

Page 17, line 15. For ἐγενῆς read εὐγενῆς.

Page 55, last line. For "[line] 2" read "[line] 4."

Page 57, last line. For "[line] 12" read "[line] 13."

Page 59, line 2 from the bottom. For δίδοντος read διδόντος.

Page 96, last line. For "Deissman" read "Deissmann" and for "p. 156" read "facing p. 187."

BRUCE M. METZGER.

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

Appiani Historia Romana, Vol. I, Prooemium, Iberica, Annabica, Libyca, Illyrica, Syriaca, Mithridatica, Fragmenta, Index. Ediderunt P. VIERECK et G. ROOS. Leipzig, 1939. Pp. xxxiv + 584. Für das Ausland geheftet RM. 18.45; gebunden RM. 19.50. (*Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana*.)

Thirty-four years after the second volume of his revision of L. Mendelssohn's 1879 text appeared, Paul Viereck, with the help of S.

Roos,¹ has now produced the first volume, a work so independent that the name of the former Teubner editor no longer appears on the title-page. The First World War was the delaying influence, and even now the book could not have appeared except for subventions from the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft and the Royal Academy of the Netherlands.

The preface follows Mendelssohn's general determination of the relation between the MSS of Appian, but with occasional corrections. No new codices for this volume have been used, while A (Mon. 374), which had hitherto occupied a very prominent place in the tradition ever since it was first used by David Hoeschel in 1599, and especially by Schweighäuser in 1785, who based his celebrated edition upon it, was long ago recognized by Viereck to be a copy of B (Ven. Marc. 387), with occasional corrections and marginal readings from unknown but inferior MSS, and hence is very seldom quoted. On the other hand a much larger number of MSS of the Byzantine Excerpts (in publishing which the junior editor is especially experienced) and of Suidas have been utilized from the newer critical editions of these sources, and this is an important fact for an author so much of whose text depends upon this secondary line of tradition from the first half of the tenth century. Whether it has been wise wholly to neglect certain other MSS of the so-called i-family, in Rome, Florence, and London, which Mendelssohn contemptuously rejected ("sordes cumulare non nollem") after but a single glance ("semel inspecti"), in view of the fact that this general branch of the tradition not only contains better readings occasionally than O and C, but also alone has preserved the contents of a good many lacunae (Viereck—Roos, p. xv), I feel strongly inclined to doubt. There may turn out to be nothing really valuable here, but to refuse even to look carefully can hardly be justified. New collations, however, for this edition were prepared for B and V by Viereck, and for L by Roos.

The text of the present volume, like that of the second (1905), differs from Mendelssohn's markedly in allowing a considerable degree of variation in spellings, like *ἀεί* and *αἰεί*, *ἐς* and *εἰς*, *σήμερον* and *τήμερον*, and all that sort of thing, and this for what seem to be substantial reasons, that is, principally, because Appian's style is deliberately variegated, because many persons in his time were notoriously inconsistent, and finally because the MSS differ so greatly, not only from one another but also from themselves, that most of the time it is impossible to be certain what Appian himself may have written in the first place. There seems to be some evidence, also (pp. xxiv-xxv), of different practice in different books, and even in different sections of the same work, which suggests, what one might have expected anyway, that the tradition of the several divisions of his enormous work in twenty-four volumes might not have been quite uniform. In that case Viereck's conclusion regarding the precise relation of Oi to V, tested only by the evidence of the Libyca (p. xxi), and hence inferred to be the same for the

¹ The valuable index nominum, of forty-six pages (to both volumes), for the sake of convenience wisely cast in Latin forms, is the work of J. E. van Niejenhuis.

rest of the books, although a good working hypothesis for the present, is certainly not yet quite proved.

Similarly the present editors are clearly justified in not rewriting Appian, as Mendelssohn too often did, in order to make his tenses, moods, and forms agree with the usage of Attic prose in the fifth and fourth centuries, proposing *πλευσείσθαι* instead of *πλείν*, *ἀγρηγμένον* instead of *ἀναιρούμενον*, *ἡπειλήκει* instead of *ἡπείλει*, and hundreds of things like that. The fact seems to be, if you can believe the best MSS at all, that Appian frequently used the imperfect for the aorist or pluperfect, and vice versa, as well as the present participle for the future, aorist, or even perfect, and was no fanatical Atticist either.

Admirable also are the usages, first introduced in the second volume long ago, of adding the date at the top of each page, and any change therefrom in the margin; of breaking up the text into sections averaging about five lines in length (something I have earnestly urged elsewhere), and adding an extremely brief, but always highly useful commentary, with cross-references, explanations, and citation of recent especially pertinent literature.

The printing is in the very highest degree accurate. Only the Greek part I find not intrinsically handsome, and certainly for me far more difficult to read rapidly than the wholly admirable and very widely used Porsonion type-face. If others feel the same way about it and so express themselves, possibly the publishers of this quite indispensable series might be induced to consider a modification. Any detail, no matter how slight, which distinctly interferes with facility in reading a text, as for example the type-faces formerly (or for that matter, even yet) employed in *Mnemosyne*, or in the Budé series of Greek texts (to say nothing of such a misfortune as Macmillan used for a while in the 'nineties, or the one that has been inflicted upon the Berlin Academy for the *Klassikertexte* and the Greek inscriptions), is an unnecessary obstacle to scholarship, and therefore out of place in scientific publications.

W. A. OLDFATHER.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS.

Collectanea Schrijnen. Verspreide Opstellen van Dr. JOS. SCHRIJNEN. Nijmegen and Utrecht, Dekker & Van de Vegt N. V., 1939. Pp. xx + 496.

Josephus Schrijnen, who died in 1938, at the age of seventy-seven years, was not only Bishop of Roermond, but also Professor of Greek and Latin Philology and General Linguistics at the University of Nijmegen, distinguished in the fields of general and Indo-European linguistics, Greek and Latin etymology and semantics, Church Latin and the history of Early Christianity, and folklore. In all these fields he wrote largely, his *Introduction to the Study of Indo-European Linguistic Science* proving (in W. Fischer's German translation), in the opinion of one of my best students in linguistic science, "the most helpful of the general treatments of the sub-

ject." As his articles were widely scattered in the periodical and other literature, it was the happy idea of his associates to issue the most notable of these in a single volume, which is that here reviewed, edited by Dr. Christine Mohrmann, P. J. Meertens, Dr. Win. Roukens. The volume includes a Bibliography (pp. xiii-xx) of 193 items (really 194, since there is an unnumbered item between 180 and 181); 47 articles (pp. 1-461); 7 indexes (pp. 462-493); contents (pp. 494-496).

While Schrijnen published in Dutch, German, French, and Latin, far the greatest part of his writing was in Dutch; and the editors have felt it desirable, for the wider use of the volume, to translate many of the articles from Dutch into German or French, the actual status in the volume being 27 in German, 14 in French, 6 in Dutch. They were, in fact, mostly published in Dutch journals, though a not inconsiderable number of his writings appeared in German, Belgian, and French journals, and a few in those of Austria, Italy, and Poland.

A critical review of a series of articles which appeared in print from 1902 to 1938 would hardly be expected, the more so as there would have to be a review of each article; a few general remarks only are in place. In any case, the years that have passed since the first publication of these articles have at some points brought new evidence which would now probably cause Schrijnen to withdraw certain interpretations: e. g., Hittite throws light on the IE verb-endings, controverting the denial of verbal *r*-endings in the original speech (p. 56). Also, the qualified support of Oštir's theory of "Alarodian" languages (pp. 33-72) as the substratum for numerous phenomena in the IE languages of the Mediterranean region—the accent of energy and the genitive in *-ī*, inter alia—seems to be *ignotum per ignotius* erklären; for the *Alarodioi* occupy just six lines in Pauly-Wissowa, and as a term for the pre-IE peoples of the region the name must be wilfully extended in meaning.

Schrijnen is one of the chief proponents of the theory that the variable initial *s-* before consonants in IE roots and words (e. g., Greek *τέγος στέγος*) is by origin a prefix, and he extends this theory to include certain other variable initials (pp. 106-127, 144-151); but these others appear so infrequently that they can be disregarded. Although numerous scholars now adhere to the theory of prefixal *s-*, I am still of the opinion that the variable *s-* was a product of wrong division of words in sentence sandhi, for final *-s* was the commonest of consonantal finals in the primitive IE, and therefore lent itself most easily to the processes of accretion or disappearance in the initial position of the succeeding word. In some instances, and with other consonants, word contaminations may have played the main rôle.

Schrijnen's theory (pp. 139-143) that the *í* and *ʷ* which may or may not be present after the initial consonant of a root is an "informative" seems to me even more dubious.

Schrijnen was much interested in the determination of the boundaries of linguistic isoglosses, and the application of them to the study of dialects (pp. 202-234); his studies apply particularly to ancient Italy, and must be thoughtfully considered by the scholar in that field.

Despite such strictures as I have made here, I am personally highly appreciative of the volume, which makes readily accessible these studies. Incidentally, the reference *Neophilologus*, VI, 90 ff. is on p. 193 attributed to 1921 and on p. xvii (in the Bibliography) to 1920: apparently the first number of the volume came out in 1920 and the subsequent issues in 1921, so that as a whole the volume is assigned to 1921, whence the contradiction.

ROLAND G. KENT.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

Diodorus of Sicily, Volume III (Books IV-VIII). With an English translation by C. H. OLDFATHER. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press, 1939. Pp. v + 433. (*Loeb Classical Library*.)

This volume of the Loeb Diodorus contains the second half of Book IV (from chap. 59), Book V, and the fragments of Books VI, VII, and VIII. A miscellaneous collection of curious material thus emerges from the comparative obscurity of the Teubner text, including the remarkable geographical descriptions of Book V and some extremely heterodox mythology. Though the Greek of Diodorus is, as a rule, fairly easy to understand, his style is not without difficulty for a translator. An English rendering cannot fail to emphasize the faults of this style, with its ever-recurring banalities: the sentences beginning with "in general" or "speaking generally," the "notable cities" and "residences of costly construction," the "altogether fertile" plains "abounding in" this and that, the "trees of every variety presenting a pleasing sight," and the many other cloying superlatives. The present reviewer is reminded of a certain lady who never tired of explaining how her sons lived in "palatial homes" and had "every mortal thing you could want." The translator does his best to ring the changes with different English adjectives; but he quite rightly does not attempt to improve on the style of his original beyond a certain point.

There is no introduction to this volume; and the notes, both critical and explanatory, are reduced to a minimum. Oldfather follows the Teubner text of Vogel fairly closely, though he sometimes disagrees over the omission of words and phrases—as, for example, in IV, 74, 3; 77, 4; V, 21, 2; 31, 1; 33, 4. He notes and sometimes adopts the readings of Jacoby in the passages quoted in *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*—for example, in V, 38, 4; 39, 6; 45, 5; VIII, frag. 7; but no indication is given in what part of Jacoby's work these readings are to be found; the work is not cited by name until p. 402 is reached. For the fragments he follows the 1906 edition of the *Excerpta Constantini Porphyrogeniti*, which was not available to Vogel, but prints the fragments in the same order as they appear in the Teubner text. He is extremely sparing with new readings of his own; I have noted only three, in V, 47, 5; V, 56, 6, and VII, frag. 5. There are a few misprints in the Greek, not worth listing here, since they are not likely to mislead the reader.

The explanatory notes are fewer and briefer than many readers

could wish, but if the complete text is to be finished in twelve volumes, there is not much space available for commentary. Under these circumstances, it is perhaps not fair to complain that (to give one example) a note on the Eridanus is needed in V, 23. On the other hand, there seems no excuse for not giving a reference to Herodotus for the wooing of Agariste (VIII, frag. 19) and for failing to distinguish between Dionysius Scytobrachion and Dionysius the Cyclographer (VII, frag. 1).

The translation calls for a few criticisms in detail. The riddle of the sphinx becomes entirely unfair when it is rendered, "What is it that is *at the same time* a biped, a triped, and a quadruped" (IV, 64, 3). The point of the last sentence in V, 29 is lost because the initial negative in the Greek is ignored. In V, 22, 4 *πέζῃ* is not "on foot" but "overland" (cf. V, 38, 5). In V, 42, 5 *καὶ αὐτοὶ δὲ οὗτοι* should be "and even they," not "and they of their own accord." In V, 17, 2 "extremely fond of wine" would be better than "exceedingly addicted to indulgence in wine"; and it is surely not true that the Gauls entered battle "with no more than a girdle about their loins" (V, 29, 2); *περιεζωσμένους* must mean "with their clothes girt about them." "Protuberances" would be more accurate than "large embossed figures" in V, 30, 2, "silvery" better than "grayish" (of infants' hair) in V, 32, 2, "devoid of comforts" better than "lacking in implements" in describing the life of the Ligurians in V, 39, 6. Sometimes the translator errs in an attempt to be literal in his rendering. "To the opposite Gaul" is not good English for *πρὸς τὴν κατ' ἀντικρὺν κειμένην Γαλατίαν* in V, 38, 5, and "a death of great vengeance" certainly does not describe the death of Sinis' victims in IV, 58, 3; it is not good English, even if *μετὰ μεγάλης τιμωρίας* is the correct Greek (which is doubtful). Furthermore, it is hard to see what end is served by writing Dioseori, Ganymedes, Pluton, Ide, and Cnosus, instead of Dioseuri, Ganymede, Pluto, Ida, and Cnossus.

There are some passages where the English is unnecessarily pompous and the abstract nouns are awkwardly piled up upon one another, but generally speaking (as Diodorus would say) this rendering is accurate and straightforward; its faults are in large measure faults of the original Greek and the translator cannot be blamed because Diodorus wrote in an undistinguished style; on the contrary, he deserves sympathy and gratitude for his patience and good workmanship.

LIONEL PEARSON.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY.

M. L. W. LAISTNER (ed.). *Bedae Venerabilis Expositio Actuum Apostolorum et Retractatio*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, The Mediaeval Academy of America, 1939. Pp. xlvī + 176. \$3.50. (*Mediaeval Acad. of America Publ.*, No. 35.)

Throughout the Middle Ages, as the worship of God was the essential activity of man, so Scriptural exegesis was the primary aim of scholarship. Mediaeval education, as nearly as we can learn, had for its main purpose the training of competent expositors, and certainly the most towering reputations during the ages of faith were

those built on interpretation of the Bible. Men thought first of the Doctors of the Latin church, and, after them, of Bede.

Thus Bede was ranked by his contemporaries, and thus he continued to be regarded for many centuries after his death. His Biblical commentaries were in universal demand while he lived, and scribes were still making copies of them as late as the fifteenth century. It is significant that his interpretation of the *Catholic Epistles*, for example, exists today in more than 150 manuscripts, whereas Hardy lists but 133 manuscripts of the *Ecclesiastical History*. The proportion is hardly accidental; rather it indicates where mediaeval scholarship laid the emphasis in valuing Bede's work.

In view of such facts we should expect the theological writings to have been widely studied in our own day, especially for the light they might throw on the methods of textual interpretation in the early Middle Ages and on the aims and content of mediaeval education. Yet, strangely, they have remained almost completely neglected, perhaps for the reason that anyone wishing to consult them has had to do so in the uncritical and often bewildering texts of Giles (*Venerabilis Bedae Opera Omnia*, Vols. 7-12 [London, 1843]) and the *Patrologia Latina* (Tom. XC-XCV). Bad editions can take the heart out of even the boldest literary explorer, whereas a clear and dependable text will encourage the weakest. Until now it has been a question of who would open a path.

An excellent beginning has been made in the volume at hand, a critical edition of Bede's *Expositio Actuum Apostolorum* and the later *Retractatio*, by M. L. W. Laistner, one of the most talented of contemporary mediaevalists and for years a devoted student of Bede. His choice of the commentaries on *Acts* was a happy one, since they not only provide an insight into Bede's expository method at two periods in his life, but also demonstrate his ability as a textual critic in his use of the Vulgate, Old Latin, and Greek versions to support his interpretation. These comments on *Acts* were among the most popular of Bede's works during the Middle Ages.

Laistner's text of the *Expositio* rests on a collation of fifteen manuscripts, most of them copied within a century of Bede's death; the two oldest belong to the end of the eighth century, the remainder to the ninth. In addition, there are descriptions of fifty-two others which Laistner examined and from which he took specimen readings. The text of the *Retractatio* is based on seven manuscripts, with a considerable collation of five more. Printed as an appendix is a critical text of the *Nomina Regionum atque Locorum de Actibus Apostolorum* so often appended to the *Expositio* in the manuscripts and probably written by Bede himself.

All three texts are supplied with full critical apparatus, arranged so as to offer the minimum of difficulty in checking the variants against the numbered lines of the page. Above the textual notes, and separated from them, are placed the citations of Bede's sources wherever he is indebted to earlier commentators. All in all, the mechanism of the text pages is as efficient and satisfying as it can well be made.

Laistner writes an introduction of thirty-four pages dealing with former editions of the two commentaries, their date of composition, the manuscripts in which they are found, the glossary of geographical names, Bede's sources, and the system of orthography to be followed

in the texts. Much of this material is valuable and interesting, especially the evidence for the dating of the two commentaries (the *Expositio* shortly after 709, the *Retractatio* between 725 and 731), the reasons for attributing the geographical glossary to Bede, and the relation between Bede's theories of spelling and the usage found in the manuscripts. Laistner's handling of evidence is careful and judicious, and one is inclined to side with him on all disputed points.

The volume closes with a series of indexes: *Scriptorum* (*Sacra Scriptura*, *Auctores*, *Codices Biblici*); *Nominum Rerumque Notabilium*; *Allegoricae Interpretationis*; *Graecitatis*. One is always grateful for such lists, especially in connection with materials of this kind, since the groupings facilitate analysis in many directions. There is a fascination, for instance, in checking through the roll of authors drawn upon by Bede, comparing his debt to Jerome with that to Augustine, observing his frequent use of Isidore's *Etymologiae*, and noting his acquaintance with such writers as Vegetius, Arator, and Cassius Felix. The other indexes are no less helpful.

Students of Bede and connoisseurs of good editing alike should welcome this volume. It marks a beginning in the adequate presentation of Bede's theological writings, and it sets a standard of scholarship against which future editors of Bede can measure their work. We hope that Professor Laistner will continue the task so well begun, and will provide us with further editions of the commentaries.

PUTNAM FENNELL JONES.

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH.

CHARLES W. JONES. *Beda's Pseudepigrapha: Scientific Writings Falsely Attributed to Bede*. Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1939. Pp. xv + 154. \$3.

In this volume, described by the author as a prelude to an edition of Bede's computistical writings, Dr. Jones has sought to clear away the large body of spurious materials traditionally associated with Bede's name.

As a preliminary he sketches the history of the Bede canon both in the Middle Ages and in the printed editions of Sichardus (1529), Noviomagus (1537), Hervagius (1563), Giles (1843), and Migne, *Patrologia Latina* (1850). It becomes clear that Hervagius was the worst offender in adulterating the canon, and that Giles, though an inadequate editor, came closest to giving us what Bede actually wrote. The editors of the *Patrologia*, preferring to err on the side of inclusiveness, brought together everything previously ascribed to Bede, and hence presented a far greater bulk of materials than Giles. Because of its comprehensiveness, Dr. Jones uses the Migne collection as the basis for his examination.

The greater part of the book is devoted to a scrutiny, item by item, of the scientific writings attributed to Bede in Volumes XC and XCIV of the *Patrologia*. The author's judgment concerning the authenticity of these pieces rests not only on the examination of a great number of computistical manuscripts and their glosses but also on a thorough familiarity with the Bede tradition both in

the Middle Ages and since; in the opinion of this reviewer, his conclusions may be trusted. The volume closes with an index and description of manuscripts, an index of citations from the *Patrologia*, and a general index.

Obviously the book is more significant for what it promises than for anything definitive in itself. The information that an edition of Bede's computistical writings is in prospect comes very agreeably to those of us who have long regretted that Bede's scientific works were available only in unsatisfactory editions. A modern edition constructed with the care and skill so evident here will be eagerly awaited. Bede deserves it, and Dr. Jones is to be congratulated on his awareness of the fact and on his willingness to undertake the task.

PUTNAM FENNELL JONES.

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH.

W. H. BUCKLER and W. M. CALDER. *Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua*, VI. Monuments and Documents from Phrygia and Caria. Manchester University Press, 1939. Pp. xxii + 166; 73 plates.

This most recent volume of the *M. A. M. A.* deals mainly with inscriptions and monuments from the borders of Caria and Phrygia, from the towns of Laodicea, Colossae, Tripolis, Attouda, Heraclea Salbace, and Tabae. To these are added a very considerable number from Apamea, Acmonia, Dioclea, Synnada, and the upper Tembris valley, together with a group of varied provenance now at Afyon Karahisar. The editors have gathered in a rich and varied harvest. There are 258 new inscriptions besides a considerable number of uninscribed monuments, and the texts of many important published documents have been revised from the original stones. Many branches of ancient studies will profit from the new material, of which only a few examples can be given in the space of this review.¹

From Laodicea come a revised text of the Hellenistic decree (no. 5), and mention of a guild of graziers, previously known only at Hierapolis (no. 11), and of a tribe named Ias (no. 18). Attouda yields further information on the family of the Carminii (nos. 74-5), and the first mention of games called Andrianteia (nos. 76, 82). The new texts from Heraclea far exceed the number previously known, and yield fresh evidence regarding the medical family of the Statilii (nos. 91, 97, 98, 105, 109, 110, 117, 118, 126, 129, 133; cf. no. 12), a decree in honor of a physician, Archelaus, "who made great use of the medical art for the benefit of the poor" (no. 114, II), another in honor of Antonius Zeno, a member of the famous Laodicean family (no. 104), the dedication of a library (no. 98), and a fragment, the first found at this place, of the preamble of Diocletian's Edict setting maximum prices (no. 102). The revision

¹ See the summaries and comment of L. Robert, *R. E. G.*, LII (1939), pp. 445 ff., nos. 4, 359, 361-2, 392-3, 396, 398, 400-3, 405, 407-13, 415, 419, 457.

of the well-known *Senatus Consultum de Tabenis* yields in line 10 the reading $\delta\pi\omega[\varsigma]$ instead of $\pi\acute{o}\lambda[ας]$ and effectively removes any evidence that neighboring towns were given to Tabae by Sulla (no. 162). From Apamea we should note the revision of the decree in honor of Cephisodorus (no. 173; cf. Robert's restorations, *R.E.G.*, LII [1939], p. 508), and of the Apamean fragments of the proconsular letter on the new calendar (nos. 174-5), a new instance of a *princeps peregrinorum* (no. 181), and the only use known in Asia Minor of the word ΙΧΘΥΣ on a Christian tomb (no. 224). The Jewish inscriptions of Acmonia are especially numerous and interesting (esp. nos. 264, 325, 334, 335, 335a). Moreover, nos. 242 and 243 reveal the location here of the cult of Zeus Orkamaneites, 250 adds one to the short list of dedications to Britannicus, and 260 shows Sornatius, a Roman merchant, interested in the Phrygian slave market. From Synnada comes mention of a second benefactor who paved 2000 feet of the agora (no. 371), and of a tropheus (no. 375), as well as texts that settle the provenance of *J.R.S.*, II (1912), pp. 243 f., nos. 3 and 4 (nos. 380, 381). Many more inscriptions which I have left unmentioned name new local and imperial grandees, officials of the imperial service, a number of professions, and several villages, and one (no. 382) is a mixed Greek and Phrygian text.

The names of the editors are themselves a sufficient guarantee of the excellence of workmanship evident to all who study the texts and commentary in this volume. It maintains the high standard set by the previous volumes, has full and useful indices, and numerous and excellent plates. Especially welcome is the appendix giving a classified list of the other inscriptions found at the places discussed, which enables each student to complete a sort of corpus of his own. The only slip I have noticed occurs in the commentary to no. 177, where the date should be changed from 65/66-69 A. D. to 69/70-74/75 A. D. (cf. no. 191).

T. R. S. BROUGHTON.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE.

ANTON VON PREMERSTEIN. *Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Giessener Universitätsbibliothek, V: Alexandrinische Geronten vor Kaiser Gaius. Ein Neues Bruchstück der sogenannten Alexandrinischen Märtyrer-Akten* (P. bibl. univ. Giss. 46). Giessen, Münchowsche Universitäts-Druckerei, 1939. Pp. iii + 71; 3 plates.

GRETE ROSENBERGER. VI: *Griechische Verwaltungsurkunden von Tebtynis aus dem Anfang des dritten Jahrhunderts n. Chr.* (P. bibl. univ. Giss. 47-53). Giessen, privately printed, 1939. Pp. iv + 44.

Fascicle V contains the long-awaited¹ edition of the Giessen fragments (G) of the so-called Acts of the Pagan Martyrs. The MS,

¹ See, e. g., *The Cambridge Ancient History*, X (1934), p. 311, n. 1.

not quite completed by von Premerstein at the time of his death, was prepared for publication by Karl Kalbfleisch, who has added occasional comments and supplementary bibliographical indications.

Von Premerstein's name has been associated with the "Acts of the Pagan Martyrs" since 1923 when he published a study² of this body of literature which remains the standard work on the subject. In the present edition we find his customary keenness of perception, our admiration of which is in this case heightened when we contemplate the unprepossessing fragments which he has brilliantly reconstructed into a continuous text and from which he has drawn a series of important conclusions. At many points his reconstruction must remain highly conjectural, but his most important conclusions rest upon passages where the sense, at any rate, is beyond doubt.

As the title of the fascicle indicates, *G* is a portion of the minutes of a hearing of Alexandrian senators before Caligula. After a brief general introduction (pp. 12-14) and a discussion of details in the reconstruction of the text (pp. 14-32), von Premerstein sets forth first the information furnished by *G* on the matter before the Emperor (pp. 32-36). It used to be thought from *P. Oxy.*, 1089 (*O*), which tells something of the events preceding the hearing recorded in *G*, that what was involved was a dispute between the Greeks and the Jews of Alexandria, and that the *gerontes* mentioned in *O* were members of the Jewish Senate of that city. But *G* now informs us that, after the accession of Gaius, the Alexandrians on their own initiative elected a *Gerousia* of 173, that the leaders of a hostile Alexandrian faction journeyed to Rome and denounced the action to the Emperor, that a delegation of the newly-elected *gerontes* followed to plead their cause and were granted a hearing by the Emperor who treated them to a display of his "grim humor"³ and ordered the illegal *Gerousia* dissolved. Thus the entire picture is changed by the new fragments. "Not Jewish *gerontes*, not quarrels and conflicts between Greeks and Jews, are involved in *O* [and *G*], but the controversy over the new Greek *Gerousia*, which had, to be sure, been decided upon by the majority of the citizen assembly, but on the other hand resulted in opposition by leading city politicians . . . and apparently in serious troubles (πόλεμος *G* III 31 ff.)" (p. 33).

Next (pp. 36-40) von Premerstein assembles all the data and drafts the chronology of the known events in the history of the Alexandrian embassies to Gaius in 37 and 38 A. D. Section V (pp. 40-42) is devoted to the claim made and reiterated by the *gerontes* that the Greeks of Alexandria have for 630 years been loyal to the rulers of Egypt (*G* II, 15-23). The number 630 is interesting, for it reveals a tradition, even if a deliberately propagandistic one, according to which there was a Greek settlement at Rhakotis already under the Saite pharaohs.

G tells us further that the illegal *Gerousia* was elected by the citizen body of 180,000. In a masterly exposition (pp. 42-57), von Premerstein musters the evidence on the size of the Alexandrian citizen body in Ptolemaic and Roman times, and demonstrates with

² *Philologus*, Supplement-Band XVI, 2.

³ *The Cambridge Ancient History*, *ibid.*

great probability that the number was raised to 180,000 from only a fraction (perhaps one-quarter) thereof between ca. 5 B. C. and 37 A. D. In keeping with the practice initiated by Augustus of giving the Greeks as a people a status intermediate between provincials and Romans, the Alexandrian citizenship was extended—no doubt by reducing the census requirement—to include practically all the Greeks of the city. Von Premerstein also considers the details of the procedure of enrollment in the citizen body, and offers incidentally the convincing explanation that the "oath of former ephebes" in *P. Teb.*, 316 was sworn to record the eligibility of young men for whom there were no vacancies yet within the *numerus clausus*. Finally, he suggests that the illegal *Gerousia* had 173 members because that was the number of Greek *amphoda* in the city.

In the course of the hearing before Caligula it was discovered that the accuser of the Alexandrians was not a Greek and could not therefore legitimately appear as plaintiff. Section VIII (pp. 62-65), devoted to "The Accuser, His Crime and His Punishment," concludes that it cannot be determined whether *καῖναι*—the punishment decreed by Caligula—means death by burning or merely branding. A final section (pp. 65-71) is devoted to the "Literary Character and Historical Utility of G." The romantic element in these "Martyr Acts" is stressed, the anti-imperial purpose of these *Tendenzschriften*, compiled ca. 215 A. D. from various sources, probably in connection with the uprising against Caracalla, is recalled. Yet much remains that has the ring of historicity. Indeed, we can but agree with von Premerstein when he characterizes G as "the fragment richest in information in the whole group" (p. 13).

Miss Rosenberger's fascicle contains much more usual, much less exciting material—seven *Verwaltungsurkunden* dating from between 213 and 225 A. D. To the texts are added translations and full, even lavish, commentaries. Nos. 47 and 48, records of payments of weavers' tax and beer tax, respectively, attest for the first time the existence of collectors called *μισθωταὶ ἱερατικῶν ὀνῶν*, no doubt the same functionaries who in several second-century papyri are called *ἐπιτηρηταὶ ἱερατικῶν ὀνῶν*. Nos. 49-51 (221 and 222 A. D.) are concerned with monthly summaries of receipts and payments sent by the *sitologos* Aurelius Polion to the *strategos* Aurelius Sereniskos. These form a single group with *P. Teb.*, 339, the date of which they serve to correct to 220 A. D. An interesting sidelight on attempted adulteration of the *annona* appears in No. 53, in which the liturgic *πεδιοφύλακες* of Tebtynis swear that they will "bring (the crops) to the usual threshing-floors, not release any in the field and not permit anyone to throw in any Nile reeds."

NAPHTALI LEWIS.

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY.

- H. OELLACHER. Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Nationalbibliothek in Wien (Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer), Neue Serie, III. Folge: Griechische literarische Papyri, II, mit Autoren-, Namen-, Wort-, und Sachindex zu I und II von H. GERSTINGER und P. SANZ. Baden bei Wien, 1939. Pp. 108. RM. 9.

This second fascicle completes the publication of the non-Christian literary papyri (so far as they have been identified as such) contained in the former Erzherzog Rainer Collection. The first fascicle devoted to this literary material was published in 1932, and other literary fragments from the collection have appeared in various periodicals since that date (see pp. 4-6). This second part was ready for the press in 1935, but its publication was delayed by financial difficulties. We now have comprehensive indices to both fascicles. Professor Gerstinger announces, in his introductory remarks (dated April, 1938), that the next publication will be that of the Christian Greek papyri, to be edited by P. Sanz, and that this will be followed by the appearance of the Hebrew papyri and the Coptic literary texts. It is to be hoped that some means will be found to provide for these publications without too great delay, but the encouragement which Professor Gerstinger finds in the fact that "dank der befreienden Tat des Führers des deutschen Volkes die alte Ostmark nach langer leidvoller Trennung wieder heimkehren durfte ins grosse deutsche Vaterland" (p. 4) now seems rather pathetic.

Even very small fragments have been included in this publication, on the chance that they might be "matched up" with pieces in other collections and thus prove important. And Gerstinger feels, particularly on account of the antiquity of the papyrus texts, that "der Papyrologe . . . hat nicht zu werten und zu wägen, sondern alles, was ihm ein gütiges Geschick in die Hand legt, mit gleicher Liebe und Sorgfalt zu umfassen und aufzuarbeiten" (p. 3). But a number of larger and more important fragments are also found in the fascicle. Those of fairly large size which contain new material are: a fragment probably of Heraclides of Miletus, *De Verbis Anomalis* (XXXIII); a number of pieces of medical works (LVII-LVIII); parts of an oration of the *στεφανωτικός* type, addressed to an emperor (LXII), and school exercises containing gnomie selections from Menander (XXIV-XXV). Some of the most interesting of the smaller fragments of lost texts are: several pieces in the epic form, probably from "catalogue poetry" (V-IX); part of a tragic choral song, perhaps from Euripides (XVIII); a school exercise containing dialogue from New Comedy, possibly Menander (XXVI); and, perhaps the most interesting of all, a piece of the third century B. C. containing a small portion (unfortunately no line is complete) from the almost contemporary New Comedy (XXII).

The fragments of extant literature include, in addition to the usual bits of Homer, about twenty lines of Aratus, *Phaenomena*, with scholia (XVII), a generous portion of Josephus, *Bell. Jud.*, II,

576-84 (XXXVI), part of Isocrates, *Philippus*, 40-42 (XL), and a bit of the treatise *Περὶ Τρόπων* assigned to Gregory of Corinth (XXXV; fourth century?). Delay in the identification of No. XL has produced a state of some confusion in the commentary; those interested in this fragment should first read the remark at the bottom of p. 67.

This review is hardly the place for a discussion of the problems of textual detail arising from these fragments, many of which are interesting. The work of editing has been carefully and efficiently done. Dr. Oellacher has given most complete descriptions of the fragments and has conservatively quoted the conjectures of various scholars about the nature of some of them merely as conjectures. The following minor adverse criticisms are included in the hope that they may be of some use to future editors of similar material. The present fascicle uses Roman numerals for the fragments, and begins again with I, not continuing the numeration of the first fascicle. The Roman numerals attached to the six photographs do not correspond with those used to identify the fragments which they depict. All this is rather inconvenient, and so is the apparent lack of arrangement of the pieces. The separation of fragments of extant literature from new material and the arrangement of the items in each category according to some principle, perhaps in approximate chronological order, seem obviously desirable.

As more and more editions of literary papyri appear in various publications, it becomes urgent that some comprehensive work of organization be done on these fragments. Oldfather's useful treatise¹ is now out of date, and any new work of similar character will soon suffer the same fate. Shall we have a *Corpus* with annual supplements, or will a continuing bibliography in the form of card indices suffice? American papyrologists have recently been discussing this subject; let us hope that these conversations will bear fruit, and that, in this country at least, there may continue to be a little time, and perhaps even a little money, for such projects.

CLINTON W. KEYES.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

¹ C. H. Oldfather, *The Greek Literary Texts from Greco-Roman Egypt* (Univ. of Wisconsin Studies in the Social Sciences and History, No. 9 [Madison, 1923]).

BOOKS RECEIVED.

(It is impossible to review all books submitted to the JOURNAL, but all are listed under BOOKS RECEIVED. Contributions sent for review or notice are not returnable.)

Alexander (William Hardy). Seneca's *Epistulae Morales*. The Text Emended and Explained (XCIII-CXXIV). *Univ. of California Publ. in Classical Philology*, XII, 10 (1942), pp. 172-216.

Ash (Harrison Boyd). Lucius Junius Moderatus Columella, On Agriculture. With a Recension of the Text and an English Translation. In three volumes, volume I: *Res Rustica I-IV*. Cambridge, Mass., *Harvard Univ. Press*; London, *William Heinemann Ltd.*, 1941. Pp. xxx + 461.

Beall (Chandler B.). La Fortune du Tasse en France. Eugene, *Univ. of Oregon and Modern Language Association of America*, 1942. Pp. xi + 308. (*Univ. of Oregon Monographs, Studies in Literature and Philology*, No. 4, January, 1942.)

Bronson (B. H.), Caldwell (J. R.), Durham (W. H.), Lehman (B. H.), McKenzie (Gordon), and Ross (J. F.). Studies in the Comic. *Univ. of California Publ. in English*, VIII, 2 (1941), pp. 155-298.

Buck (Philo M., Jr.). Directions in Contemporary Literature. New York, *Oxford Univ. Press*, 1942. Pp. xiii + 353. \$2.25.

Care (The) of Records in a National Emergency. *Bulletins of the National Archives*, No. 3. Pp. 36.

Chadwick (N. Kershaw). Poetry and Prophecy. Cambridge, *University Press*, 1942. Pp. xvi + 110; frontispiece; 7 plates. \$1.75.

Colby (Elbridge). Army Talk, A Familiar Dictionary of Soldier Speech. Princeton, *Princeton Univ. Press*, 1942. Pp. xiii + 232. Illustrated by Richard Hurd. \$2.00.

Dinsmoor (William Bell). Observations on the Hephaisteion. *American School of Classical Studies in Athens*, 1941. Pp. 171; frontispiece; 76 figures. (*Hesperia*, Supplement V.)

Dohan (Edith Hall). Italic Tomb-Groups in the University Museum. Philadelphia, *Univ. of Pennsylvania Press*; London, *Humphrey Milford*, *Oxford Univ. Press*, 1942. Pp. xii + 113; frontispiece, 55 plates, 69 text figures. \$7.50.

Evolution (The) of Balzac's *Comédie humaine*. Studies edited by E. Preston Dargan and Bernard Weinberg. Chicago, *Univ. of Chicago Press*, 1942. Pp. xi + 441; 1 plate.

Fontenrose (Joseph E.). Notes on Some Didymaeon Inscriptions. *Univ. of California Publ. in Classical Philology*, XII, 9 (1942), pp. 165-174.

Fontenrose (Joseph E.). *Varia Critica*. *Univ. of California Publ. in Classical Philology*, XII, 11 (1942), pp. 217-224.

Gelson (Sister Mary Aline). An Analysis of the Realistic Elements in the Novels of René Bazin. Washington, D. C., *Catholic Univ. of America*, 1942. Pp. xiii + 153. (Diss.)

Greek (The) Historians. The Complete and Unabridged Historical Works of Herodotus, Translated by George Rawlinson; Thucydides, Translated by Benjamin Jowett; Xenophon, Translated by Henry G. Dakyns; Arrian, Translated by Edward J. Chinnoek. Edited, with an introduction, revisions and additional notes, by Francis R. B. Godolphin. New York, *Random House*, 1942. Two volumes. Pp. xxxviii + 1001; 964. \$6.

Haber (Tom B.). A Writer's Handbook of American Usage. New York, London, Toronto, *Longmans, Green & Co.*, 1942. Pp. viii + 152. \$1.00.

Hand (Wayland D.). A Dictionary of Words and Idioms Associated with Judas Iscariot. A Compilation Based Mainly on Material Found in the Germanic Languages. *Univ. of California Publ. in Modern Philology*, XXIV, 3 (1942), pp. 289-356.

Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, LII; Index of Authors and Subjects, I-L. Cambridge, *Harvard Univ. Press*, 1941. Pp. 159.

Howell (Wilbur Samuel). The Rhetoric of Alcuin and Charlemagne. A Translation, with an Introduction, the Latin Text, and Notes. Princeton, *Princeton Univ. Press*, 1941. Pp. xii + 175. \$3.50. (*Princeton Studies in English*, XXIII.)

Marekwardt (Albert H.). Introduction to the English Language. Toronto, New York, *Oxford Univ. Press*, 1942. Pp. xvii + 347. \$2.15.

Miller (Mary Cecilia). The Elegiae in Maecenatem with Introduction, Text, Translation and Commentary. Philadelphia, 1941. Pp. 176. (Diss.)

Milne (J. G.). Kolophon and its Coinage: A Study. New York, *American Numismatic Society*, 1941. Pp. 113; 19 plates. (*Numismatic Notes and Monographs*, No. 96.)

Mosser (Sawyer McA.). The Endicott Gift of Greek and Roman Coins, Including the "Catacombs" Hoard. New York, *American Numismatic Society*, 1941. Pp. 52; frontispiece; 9 plates. (*Numismatic Notes and Monographs*, No. 97.)

Mylonas (George Emmanuel). The Hymn to Demeter and Her Sanctuary at Eleusis. St. Louis, 1942. Pp. xii + 99. \$1.00. (*Washington Univ. Studies*, New Series, *Language and Literature*, XIII.)

Persson (Axel W.). The Religion of Greece in Prehistoric Times. Berkeley, *Univ. of California Press*, 1942. Pp. 189; frontispiece; 10 plates; 29 text figures. \$2.00. (*Sather Classical Lectures*, XVII.)

Price (Lawrence Marsden). Christian Heinrich Schmid and his Translations of English Dramas 1767-1789. *Univ. of California Publ. in Modern Philology*, XXVI, 1 (1942), pp. x + 1-122; frontispiece; 4 illus.

Princeton Verse Between Two Wars. An Anthology. Edited, with a Preface, by Allen Tate. Princeton, *Princeton Univ. Press*, 1942. Pp. xx + 112. \$2.50.

Ross (John F.). Swift and Defoe. A Study in Relationship. Pp. xii + 152. (*Univ. of California Publ. in English*, XI.)

Smith (C. Willard). Browning's Star-Imagery. The Study of a Detail in Poetic Design. Princeton, *Princeton Univ. Press*, 1941. Pp. 252. \$3.50. (*Princeton Studies in English*, XXI.)

Tillotson (Geoffrey). Essays in Criticism and Research. Cambridge, *University Press*; New York, *Macmillan Company*, 1942. Pp. xxix + 215. \$3.75.

Trevelyan (Humphry). Goethe and the Greeks. Cambridge, *University Press*; New York, *Macmillan Company*, 1941. Pp. xvi + 321. \$3.75.

Webb (William S.) and De Jarnette (David L.), with additions by Walter B. Jones, J. P. E. Morrison, Marshall T. Newman and Charles E. Snow and William G. Haag. An Archeological Survey of Pickwick Basin in the Adjacent Portions of the States of Alabama, Mississippi and Tennessee. Washington, D. C., *U. S. Gov't. Printing Office*, 1942. Pp. xxii + 536; 316 plates; 2 maps; 99 text figures. (*Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin* 129.)

Weber (Shirley H.). Schliemann's First Visit to America 1850-1851. Cambridge, Mass., *Harvard Univ. Press*, Published for The American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1942. Pp. ix + 111. (*Gennadeion Monographs*, II.)

Wheelwright (Philip), Brooks (Cleanth), Richards (I. A.), Stevens (Wallace). The Language of Poetry. Edited by Allen Tate. Princeton, *Princeton Univ. Press*, 1942. Pp. x + 125. \$2.00.

INDEX TO VOLUME LXIII.

	PAGE
Ambrosiai Stelai,	215-216
Apollodorus and the Speech Against Neaera (Pseudo- Dem. LIX),	257-271
Aristides, On the Authorship of the Leptinean Declama- tions Attributed to,	154-173
Arybbas, King of Epirus, The Meaning of <i>Consensco</i> and,	129-153
BENEDICT, COLEMAN H. The Romans in Southern Gaul,	38-50
BOOKS RECEIVED, 126-128, 254-256 384, 499-500	
BROUGHTON, T. ROBERT S. Cleopatra and "The Treas- ure of the Ptolemies,"	328-332
Caesar's Colleagues in the Pontifical College,	385-412
<i>Captivi</i> , The Structure of the,	26-37
CASSON, LIONEL. Note on a Nile Boat,	333-334
Cleopatra and "The Treasure of the Ptolemies,"	328-332
<i>Consensco</i> , The Meaning of, and King Arybbas of Epirus,	129-153
Damagetus, A New Epigram by,	78-82
Erin, The Sovereignty of,	444-454
FINK, ROBERT O. Mommsen's <i>Pridianum: B. G. U.</i> , 696, 61-71	
FOWLER, MURRAY. Ambrosiai Stelai,	215-216
FRÄNKEL, HERMANN. Correc- tion to the Note on Men- ander's <i>Epitrepontes</i> , Vol. LXII, pp. 355 f.,	466
Zeno of Elea's Attacks on Plurality,	1-25, 193-206
FRIEDLÄNDER, PAUL. Heracliti Frag. 124,	336
A New Epigram by Dama- getus,	78-82

	PAGE
Gaul, Southern, The Romans in,	38-50
Gender (The) of Nouns Ending in -inthos,	320-327
Γλώσσαργος and στόμαργος, The Etymology and Meaning of,	87-90
GODOLPHIN, F. R. B. The Author of the <i>περί ψύχου</i> ,	83-86
GRAY, LOUIS H. Possible Tro- chaic Dimeters in Non- Latin Italic and in Gaul- ish Inscriptions,	433-443
GREEN, WILLIAM M. The Dying World of Lucretius,	51-60
HEICHELHEIM, F. M. From Asia Minor to India,	91
Heracliti Frag. 124,	336
HIGHET, GILBERT. The Ship- wrecked Slaver,	462-466
HOUGH, JOHN N. The Struc- ture of the <i>Captivi</i> ,	26-37
India, From Asia Minor to,	91
Jerome, A Pythagorean Idea in,	207-215
KOBER, ALICE E. The Gender of Nouns Ending in -inthos,	320-327
KRAPPE, ALEXANDER H. The Sovereignty of Erin,	444-454
LENZ, FRIEDRICH WALTER. On the Authorship of the Lep- tinean Declamations At- tributed to Aristides,	154-173
Literary History, A New Pro- gram for the Teaching of,	308-319
Lucretius, The Dying World of,	51-60
MACURDY, GRACE H. Apollo- dorus and the Speech Against Neaera (Pseudo- Dem. LIX),	257-271
MARCUS, RALPH. Note on an Aramaic Etymology in Plutarch's <i>Isis and Osiris</i> ,	335

- | | PAGE | | PAGE |
|---|---------|---|---------|
| Menander's <i>Epitrepontes</i> , Correction to the Note on, Vol. LXII, pp. 355 f., | 466 | <i>Bieber's</i> The History of the Greek and Roman Theater (OSCAR BRONEER), | 248-250 |
| Neaera, Apollodorus and the Speech Against (Pseudo-Dem. LIX), | 257-271 | <i>Bolkestein's</i> Wohltätigkeit und Armenpflege im vorchristlichen Altertum (ARTHUR STANLEY PEASE), | 378-379 |
| NEUGEBAUER, O. On Two Astronomical Passages in Plutarch's <i>De Animae Procreatione in Timaeo</i> , | 455-459 | Buckler, <i>see</i> Anatolian Studies. | |
| Nile Boat, Note on a, | 333-334 | <i>Buckler and Calder's</i> Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua, VI: Monuments and Documents from Phrygia and Caria (T. R. S. BROUGH-TON), | 493-494 |
| NORWOOD, GILBERT. Two Notes on Pindar, <i>Isthmian</i> I and VII, | 460-461 | Calder, <i>see</i> Buckler. | |
| NOTOPOULOS, JAMES A. Plato's Epitaph, | 272-293 | Collectanea Schrijnen. Verspreide Opstellen van Dr. Jos. Schrijnen (ROLAND G. KENT), | 487-489 |
| Ostraca, Brief Notes on Michigan, | 72-77 | <i>Colwell and Mantey's</i> A Hellenistic Greek Reader: Selections from the Koine of the New Testament Period, with Vocabulary and Notes (ROGER A. PACK), | 380-381 |
| Papyri, Notes on, | 294-307 | Conferenze Augustee nel bi-millenario della nascita (ROBERT SAMUEL ROGERS), | 358-360 |
| PEARL, ORSAMUS M. Notes on Papyri (with HERBERT C. YOUTIE), | 294-307 | <i>Cooper's</i> Aristotelian Papers, Revised and Reprinted (WILLIAM NICKERSON, BATES), | 383 |
| <i>Περὶ ψυχῆς</i> , The Author of the, | 83-86 | <i>Deferrari, Barry</i> , and <i>Maguire's</i> A Concordance of Ovid (W. A. OLDFATHER), | 105-108 |
| Pindar, <i>Isthmian</i> I and VII, Two Notes on, | 460-461 | <i>Deferrari, Fanning</i> , and <i>Sullivan's</i> A Concordance of Lucan (W. A. OLDFATHER), | 105-108 |
| Plato's Epitaph, | 272-293 | <i>Deutsch's</i> The Pattern of Sound in Lucretius (RAYMOND MANDRA), | 376-377 |
| Plutarch's <i>De Animae Procreatione in Timaeo</i> , On Two Astronomical Passages in, | 455-459 | Edgar, <i>see</i> Hunt. | |
| Plutarch's <i>Isis and Osiris</i> , Note on an Aramaic Etymology in, | 335 | <i>Ernout and Meillet's</i> Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine: histoire des mots, nouvelle édition (LOUIS H. GRAY), | 374-375 |
| Pontifical College, Caesar's Colleagues in the, | 385-412 | Fanning, <i>see</i> Deferrari. | |
| <i>Pridianum</i> , Mommsen's: <i>B. G. U.</i> , 696, | 61-71 | <i>Fox's</i> The Life and Times of St. Basil the Great as Revealed in His Works (ROGER A. PACK), | 122-123 |
| PRITCHETT, KENDRICK. The Tribe Ptolemais, | 413-432 | | |
| Ptolemaic (The) Copper Inflation, ca. 230-140 B. C., | 174-192 | | |
| Ptolemais, The Tribe, | 413-432 | | |
| QUASTEN, JOHANNES. A Pythagorean Idea in Jerome, | 207-215 | | |
| REVIEWS: | | | |
| Anatolian Studies Presented to William Hepburn Buckler (ARTHUR DABBY NOCK), | 349-352 | | |
| Arntz, <i>see</i> Hirt. | | | |
| Barry, <i>see</i> Deferrari. | | | |
| Bengtson, <i>see</i> Otto. | | | |

	PAGE
<i>Getty's M. Annaei Lucani De Bello Civili Liber I</i> (R. M. HAYWOOD),	382-383
<i>Gray's Foundations of Language</i> (FRANK R. BLAKE),	337-342
<i>Heaton's Mob Violence in the Late Roman Republic</i> , 133-49 B. C. (WILLIAM G. FLETCHER),	372-373
† <i>Hirt and Arntz's Die Hauptprobleme der indogermanischen Sprachwissenschaft</i> (P. E. DUMONT),	123-124
<i>Hubaux and Leroy's Le Mythe du Phénix dans les Littératures grecque et latine</i> (JAMES HUTTON),	342-345
<i>Hunt, Smyly, and Edgar's The Tebtunis Papyri</i> , Volume III, Part II (HERBERT C. YOUTIE),	244-248
<i>Husselman's A Fragment of Kalilah and Dimnah from MS. 397 in the Pierpont Morgan Library</i> (CLINTON W. KEYES),	381-382
<i>Jones' Bedae Pseudepigrapha: Scientific Writings Falsely Attributed to Bede</i> (PUTNAM FENNEL JONES),	492-493
<i>Junge's Saka-Studien. Der ferne Nordosten im Weltbild der Antike</i> (AUBREY DILLER),	253-254
<i>Kent's Varro, On the Latin Language</i> , Vols. I and II (E. H. STURTEVANT),	361-363
<i>Kitto's Greek Tragedy: A Literary Study</i> (ALFRED CARY SCHLESINGER),	251-253
<i>Knox's St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles</i> (ARTHUR DARBY NOCK),	476-480
<i>Laistner's Bedae Venerabilis Expositio Actuum Apostolorum et Retractatio</i> (PUTNAM FENNEL JONES),	490-492
Leroy, <i>see</i> Hubaux.	
<i>Lutz's Iohannis Scotti Annotationes in Marcianum</i> (PAUL OSKAR KRISTELLER),	480-483
Maguire, <i>see</i> Deferrari.	
Mantey, <i>see</i> Colwell.	

	PAGE
<i>Meier's Das Wesen der spartanischen Staatsordnung: Nach ihren lebengesetzlichen und bodenrechtlichen Voraussetzungen</i> (L. R. SHERO),	345-349
Meillet, <i>see</i> Ernout.	
<i>Morrow's Plato's Law of Slavery in its Relation to Greek Law</i> (STANLEY B. SMITH),	365-367
<i>Müller's Das Verhältnis von Apuleius De Mundo zu seiner Vorlage</i> (JOSEPH P. MAGUIRE),	369-370
<i>Murray's Demosthenes, Private Orations</i> , Vols. II-III (MALCOLM F. MCGREGOR),	367-369
<i>Nisbet's M. Tulli Ciceronis De Domo Sua Ad Pontifices Oratio</i> (WILLIAM G. FLETCHER),	374
<i>Norden's Aus altrömischen Priesterbüchern</i> (J. WHATMOUGH),	225-230
<i>Oellacher's Mitteilungen zur Papyrussammlung der Nationalbibliothek in Wien</i> (Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer), Neue Serie, III. Folge: Griechische literarische Papyri, II (CLINTON W. KEYES),	497-498
<i>Oldfather's Diodorus of Sicily</i> , Vol. III (LIONEL PEARSON),	489-490
<i>Otto and Bengtson's Zur Geschichte des Niederganges des Ptolemäerreiches</i> (ARTHUR DARBY NOCK),	217-224
<i>Owen's Euripides, Ion</i> (GILBERT NORWOOD),	109-113
<i>Parke's A History of the Delphic Oracle</i> (JOSEPH E. FONTENROSE),	472-476
<i>Pearson's Early Ionian Historians</i> (K. v. FRITZ),	113-116
<i>Peeters' Les Fastes d'Ovide, Histoire du Texte</i> (BROOKS OTIS),	467-472
<i>Pöstgens' Tibulls Ambarvalgedicht</i> (II, 1) (HENRY T. ROWELL),	352-355
<i>von Premmerstein's Alexandrinische Geronten vor Kaiser Gaius. Ein Neues</i>	

	PAGE		PAGE
Bruchstück der sogenannten Alexandrinischen Märtyrer-Akten (P. bibl. univ. Giss. 46) (NAPHTALI LEWIS),	494-496	Turner's Catalogue of Greek and Latin Papyri and Ostraca in the Possession of the University of Aberdeen (BRUCE M. METZGER),	483-485
Radermacher's Mythos und Sage bei den Griechen (JOSEPH E. FONTENROSE),	125-126	Viereck and Roos' Appiani Historia Romana, Vol. I (W. A. OLDFATHER),	485-487
Robinson's Manuscripts 27 (S. 29) and 107 (S. 129) of the Municipal Library of Autun: A Study of Spanish Half-uncial and Early Visigothic Minuscule and Cursive Scripts (LESLIE WEBBER JONES),	377-378	Walzer's Eraclito: Raccolta dei Frammenti e Traduzione Italiana (†W. A. HEIDEL),	119-120
Roos, see Viereck.		Yale Classical Studies, VI (ALICE F. BRAUNLICH),	124-125
Rosenberger's Griechische Verwaltungsurkunden von Tebtynis aus dem Anfang des dritten Jahrhunderts n. Chr. (P. bibl. univ. Giss. 47-53) (NAPHTALI LEWIS),	494-496	Young's Late Geometric Graves and a Seventh Century Well in the Agora (F. O. WAAGÉ),	363-365
Rostagni's La letteratura di Roma repubblicana ed Augustea (GILBERT HIGHET),	92-104	SEGRÈ, A. The Ptolemaic Copper Inflation, ca. 230-140 B. C.	174-192
Roussel's Sparte (MALCOLM F. MCGREGOR),	121-122	Shipwrecked (The) Slaver,	462-466
Schrijnen, see Collectanea.		SPITZER, LEO. A New Program for the Teaching of Literary History,	308-319
Schuster's Tibull-Studien. Beiträge zur Erklärung und Kritik Tibulls und des Corpus Tibullianum (HENRY T. ROWELL),	230-238	Στόμαργος and γλώσσαργος, The Etymology and Meaning of,	87-90
Smyly, see Hunt.		TAYLOR, LILY ROSS. Caesar's Colleagues in the Pontifical College,	385-412
Stanford's Ambiguity in Greek Literature (GEORGE E. DUCKWORTH),	117-119	TREVES, P. The Meaning of Consenesco and King Arybbas of Epirus,	129-153
Steidle's Studien zur Ars poetica des Horaz. Interpretation des auf Dichtkunst und Gedicht bezüglichen Hauptteiles (Verse 1-294) (CRAIG LA DRIÈRE),	238-243	Trochaic Dimeters in Non-Latin Italic and in Gaulish Inscriptions, Possible,	433-443
Stella's Importanza di Alceone nella storia del pensiero greco (LUDWIG EDELSTEIN),	371-372	WILLIS, WILLIAM H. The Etymology and Meaning of γλώσσαργος and στόμαργος,	87-90
Sullivan, see Deferrari.		YOUTIE, HERBERT C. Brief Notes on Michigan Ostraca,	72-77
Teggart's Rome and China. A Study of Correlations in Historical Events (FREDERIC C. LANE),	355-358	Notes on Papyri (with ORSAMUS M. PEARL),	294-307
		Zeno of Elea's Attacks on Plurality,	1-25, 193-206

SEP 21 1942

Vol. LXIII, 4

WHOLE No. 252

h

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

Founded by B. L. GILDERSLEEVE

Edited by

HAROLD CHERNISS

KEMP MALONE, BENJAMIN D. MERITT
DAVID M. ROBINSON, HENRY T. ROWELL

OCTOBER, 1942

BALTIMORE, MARYLAND
THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Caesar's Colleagues in the Pontifical College. By LILY ROSS TAYLOR,	385
The Tribe Ptolemais. By KENDRICK PRITCHETT, - - -	413
Possible Trochaic Dimeters in Non-Latin Italic and in Gaulish Inscriptions. By LOUIS H. GRAY, - - -	433
The Sovereignty of Erin. By ALEXANDER H. KRAPPE, - - -	444
On Two Astronomical Passages in Plutarch's <i>De Animae Pro- creatione In Timaeo</i> . By O. NEUGEBAUER, - - -	455
Two Notes on Pindar, <i>Isthmian</i> I and VII. By GILBERT NORWOOD,	460
The Shipwrecked Slaver. By GILBERT HIGHET, - - -	462
Correction to the Note on Menander's <i>Epitrepontes</i> , Vol. LXII, pp. 355 f. By HERMANN FRÄNKEL, - - -	466
REVIEWS: - - - - -	467
<i>Peeters' Les Fastes d'Ovide, Histoire du Texte</i> (BROOKS OTIS).— <i>Parke's A History of the Delphic Oracle</i> (JOSEPH E. FONTENROSE).— <i>Knox's St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles</i> (ARTHUR DARBY NOCK).— <i>Lutz's Iohannis Scotti Annotationes in Marcianum</i> (PAUL OSKAR KRISTELLER).— <i>Turner's Catalogue of Greek and Latin Papyri and Ostraca in the Possession of the University of Aberdeen</i> (BRUCE M. METZGER).— <i>Viereck and Roos's Appiani Historia Romana, Vol. I</i> (W. A. OLDFATHER).— <i>Collectanea Schrijnen, Verspreide Opstellen van Dr. Jos. Schrijnen</i> (ROLAND G. KENT).— <i>Oldfather's Diodorus of Sicily, Vol. III</i> (Books IV-VIII) (LIONEL PEAR- SON).— <i>Laistner's Bedae Venerabilis Expositio Actuum Apostolorum et Retractatio</i> (PUTNAM FENNELL JONES).— <i>Jones' Bedae Pseudepigrapha: Scientific Writings Falsely Attributed to Bede</i> (PUTNAM FENNELL JONES).— <i>Buckler and Calder's Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua, VI: Monuments and Documents from Phrygia and Caria</i> (T. R. S. BROUGH- TON).— <i>von Premerstein's Alexandrinische Geronten vor Kaiser Gaius. Ein Neues Bruchstück der sogenannten Alexandrinischen Märtyrer-Akten</i> (P. bibl. univ. Giss. 46) (NAPHTALI LEWIS).— <i>Rosenberger's Griechische Ver- waltungsurkunden von Tebtynis aus dem Anfang des dritten Jahrhunderts n. Chr.</i> (P. bibl. univ. Giss. 47-53) (NAPHTALI LEWIS).— <i>Oellacher's Mit- teilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Nationalbibliothek in Wien</i> (Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer) Neue Serie, III. Folge: Griechische literarische Papyri, II (CLINTON W. KEYES).	
BOOKS RECEIVED, - - - - -	499
INDEX TO VOLUME LXIII, - - - - -	501

The American Journal of Philology is open to original communications in all depart-
ments of philology, and especially in the field of Greek and Roman studies. It is
published quarterly. Four numbers constitute a volume, one volume each year. Sub-
scription price, \$5.00 a year, payable in advance (foreign postage 25 cents extra);
single numbers, \$1.50 each.

Articles intended for publication in the Journal, books for review, and other editorial
communications should be addressed to the editor, Harold Cherniss; proof should be
returned to the secretary, Evelyn H. Clift, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore,
Maryland.

Contributors are entitled to receive twenty-five copies of their respective contribu-
tions free of charge. Additional copies will be supplied at cost.

Subscriptions, remittances, and business communications should be sent to

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS, Baltimore, Md.

The contents of the American Journal of Philology are indexed
regularly in the International Index to Periodicals.

Entered as second-class matter October 16, 1911, at the postoffice at Baltimore,
Maryland, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103,
Act of October 3, 1917. Authorized on July 3, 1918.

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY J. H. FURST COMPANY, BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY STUDIES IN ARCHAEOLOGY

EDITED BY DAVID M. ROBINSON

1. The Roman Toga. By Lillian M. Wilson. 132 pages. 102 illustrations. \$5.00.
2. The History and Civilization of Ancient Megara. By E. L. Highbarger. 234 pages. 6 illustrations. Paper, \$2.50; cloth, \$3.00.
3. Ancient Sicyon with a Prosopographia Sicyonia. By Charles H. Skalet. 234 pages. 17 illustrations. \$2.50.
4. The Negro in Greek and Roman Civilization: A Study of the Ethiopian Type. By Grace Hadley Beardsley. 154 pages. 24 illustrations. \$3.50.
5. Les Cultes de Patras: Avec une Prosopographie Patréenne. By Jules Herbillon. 199 pages. \$3.00.
6. Excavations at Olynthus. Part I. The Neolithic Settlement. By George E. Mylonas. 126 pages. 96 plates. \$7.50.
7. The Greek Tradition in Sculpture. By Walter R. Agard. 70 pages. 34 illustrations. \$3.00.
8. Ancient Corinth, with a Topographical Sketch of the Corinthia. Part I. From the Earliest Times to 404 B. C. By J. G. O'Neill. 270 pages. 9 plates and large folded plan of excavations. \$5.00.
9. Excavations at Olynthus. Part II. Architecture and Sculpture. By David M. Robinson. 177 pages. 315 illustrations. \$20.00.
10. Papyri in the Princeton University Collections. Edited by Allan Chester Johnson and Henry Bartlett van Hoesen. 169 pages. \$7.50.
11. Excavations at Olynthus. Part III. The Coins Found at Olynthus. By David M. Robinson. 143 pages. 28 plates. \$10.00.
12. Excavations at Olynthus. Part IV. The Terra-Cottas Found at Olynthus. By David M. Robinson. 119 pages. 62 plates. \$10.00.
13. Sculptured Portraits of Greek Statesmen: With a Special Study of Alexander the Great. By Elmer G. Suhr. 202 pages. 21 plates. \$4.50.
14. Hellenistic Queens: A Study of Woman-Power in Macedonia, Seleucid Syria, and Ptolemaic Egypt. By Grace Harriet Macurdy. 265 pages. 12 plates. \$4.00.
15. Early Civilization in Thessaly. By Hazel D. Hansen. 222 pages. 178 illustrations. \$4.00.
16. Old Age Among the Ancient Greeks. By Bessie Ellen Richardson. 391 pages. 16 plates. \$4.00.
17. A History of Olynthus. By Mabel Gude. 122 pages. \$2.50.
18. Excavations at Olynthus. Part V. Mosaics, Vases, and Lamps of Olynthus found in 1928 and 1931. By David M. Robinson. 320 pages. 209 plates. \$15.00.
19. Excavations at Olynthus. Part VI. The Coins Found at Olynthus in 1931. By David M. Robinson. 126 pages. 30 plates. \$10.00.
20. Excavations at Olynthus. Part VII. The Terra-Cottas of Olynthus Found in 1931. By David M. Robinson. 123 pages. 61 plates. \$10.00.
21. Pindar: A Poet of Eternal Ideas. By David M. Robinson. 126 pages. \$3.00.
22. Vassal-Queens and Some Contemporary Women under the Roman Empire. By Grace H. Macurdy. 160 pages. 6 plates. \$3.00.
23. A Study of the Greek Love-Names, Including a Discussion of Paederasty and a Prosopographia. By David M. Robinson and Edward J. Fluck. 212 pages. 1 plate. \$3.00.
24. The Clothing of the Ancient Romans. By Lillian M. Wilson. 191 pages. 118 illustrations. \$5.00.
25. Excavations at Olynthus. Part VIII. The Hellenic House. By David M. Robinson and J. Walter Graham. 391 pages. 36 figures and 111 plates. \$15.00.
26. Excavations at Olynthus. Part IX. The Chalcidic Mint and the Excavation Coins Found in 1928-1934. By David M. Robinson and Paul Augustus Clement. 446 pages. 36 plates. \$15.00.
27. The Ape in Antiquity. By William C. McDermott. 349 pages. 10 plates. \$5.00.
28. Etruscan Perugia. By Chandler Shaw. 115 pages. 16 plates. \$2.75.
29. The Common People of Pompeii: A Study of the Graffiti. By Helen H. Tanzer. 113 pages. 49 illustrations. \$3.50.
30. The Gates of Dreams. An Archaeological Examination of Vergil, *Aeneid* VI, 893-899. By E. L. Highbarger. 149 pages. 15 illustrations. \$3.00.
31. Excavations at Olynthus. Part X. Metal and Minor Miscellaneous Finds. An Original Contribution to Greek Life. By David M. Robinson. 610 pages. 33 figures. 171 plates. 1 map. \$20.00.
32. Excavations at Olynthus. Part XI. Necrolynthia. A Study in Greek Burial Customs and Anthropology. By David M. Robinson. 307 pages. 26 figures. 70 plates. 1 map. \$15.00.
33. Two Currents in the Thought-Stream of Europe: A History of Opposing Points of View. By Elmer G. Suhr. 480 pages. \$5.00.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

BALTIMORE

An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome

- I. *Rome and Italy of the Republic*. By TENNEY FRANK. 445 pages. Now out of print.
 - II. *Roman Egypt to the Reign of Diocletian*. By ALLAN CHESTER JOHNSON. 742 pages, \$4.00.
 - III. *The Four Western Provinces*. By R. G. COLLINGWOOD; J. J. VAN NOSTRAND; V. M. SCRAMUZZA; and ALBERT GRENIER. 672 pages. \$4.00.
 - IV. *Roman Africa*, by R. M. HAYWOOD, 120 pp.
Roman Syria, by F. M. HEICHELHEIM, 133 pp.
Roman Greece, by J. A. O. LARSEN, 240 pp.
Roman Asia, by T. R. S. BROUGHTON. 420 pp.
Indices. 950 pages, \$5.00.
 - V. *Rome and Italy of the Empire*, by TENNEY FRANK, 461 pages.
General Index to Volumes I-V, 146 pages. 2 volumes \$5.75.
-

ARISTOTLE'S CRITICISM OF PRESOCRATIC PHILOSOPHY

By HAROLD CHERNISS. 432 pages, \$4.00.

THE SYNTAX OF THE GENITIVE CASE IN ARISTOPHANES

By JAMES WILSON POULTNEY. 250 pages, \$3.50.

SELECTIONS FROM THE BRIEF MENTION OF BASIL LANNEAU GILDERSLEEVE

Edited with a biographical sketch and an index by CHARLES
WILLIAM EMIL MILLER. 546 pages, frontispiece, \$4.50.

STUDIES IN HONOR OF HERMANN COLLITZ

By American and foreign scholars. 341 pages, frontispiece, \$5.00.

L'AGNIHOTRA: Description de l'agnihotra dans le rituel védique

Par P.-E. DUMONT. xv + 225 pages, \$3.00 paper and \$3.50
cloth.

L'ĪŚVARAGĪTĀ, LE CHANT DE ŚIVA

Texte extrait du Kurma-purāṇa. Traduit du Sanskrit par P.-E.
DUMONT. 251 pages, paper, \$3.00.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS • BALTIMORE

